In compliance with the
Canadian Privacy Legislation
some supporting forms
may have been removed from
this dissertation.

While these forms may be included
in the document page count,
their removal does not represent
any loss of content from the dissertation.

University of Alberta

"Agreement and Disagreement Strategies in Russian News Interviews: a linguistic perspective"

by

Diana Rattai

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Department of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall 2003

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services
Acquisisitons et services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 0-612-87589-X
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 0-612-87589-X

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou aturement reproduits sans son autorisation.

Canada

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Diana Rattai

Title of Thesis: "Agreement and Disagreement Strategies in Russian News Interviews: A linguistic perspective"

Degree: Master of Arts

Year this Degree Granted: 2003

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as herein before provided, neither the thesis nor anyt substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission

Signature

August 8, 2003

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Agreement and Disagreement Strategies in Russian News Interviews: a linguistic perspective" submitted by Diana Rattai in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Dr. Elisabeth Le

Dr. Tom Priestly

Dr. Elena Krevsky

August 6, 2003

Abstract

This thesis examines Russian agreement and disagreement strategies in the context of the radio news interview following the methodology of Conversation Analysis. As a reference point, styles and patterns of English agreement and disagreement are outlined first. In the analysis section agreement and disagreement in four Russian news interviews are studied. It was found that in Russian strong agreement forms outnumbered weak forms 31 to 21; the weak variety being used predominantly by the interviewee, and the strong variety used by both interviewer and interviewee. Disagreement was less common than agreement, and within that, weak disagreement outnumbered strong agreement 25 to 16. In the discussion section a method of classifying news interviews based on the four interaction patterns of Affiliation, Manipulation, Moderate Dispute and Intense Dispute is created and developed. These four patterns are discussed individually, as well as in terms of spanning a continuum ranging from Collaboration to Opposition.

List of Abbreviations

Affiliation: AF
Agreement Via Interviewer: AIR
Agreement with Disagreement Preface: DGAG
Direct Agreement: DA
Disagreement by Question: DBQ
Disagreement with Agreement Preface: AGDG
Disagreement with Repair: DWR
Downgrading: DGAG
Interivewee: IE
Interviewer: IR
Qualified Disagreement: QD
Same Evaluation: SE
Strong Contradiction: SCD
Strong Disagreement: SD
Token Agreement: TA
Upgrading: U
Weak Contradiction: WCD

List of Figures

Figure 1: Continuum of Collaboration ~ Opposition.....121

List of Tables

Table 1: Overall Results of Analysis of Russian Agreement and Disagreement.....72

CHAPTER 1 – REVIEW OF LITERATURE 6

1. INTRODUCTION 6

1.1 LANGUAGE AND CULTURE 6

1.2 OUTLINE 9

2. THE NEWS INTERVIEW IN RUSSIA AND THE WEST 10

2.1 ENGLISH INTERVIEW CONVENTIONS 10

2.2 RUSSIAN NEWS INTERVIEW IDEOLOGIES/VALUES 12

2.2.1 STATE OWNED RUSSIAN RADIO 15

2.3 CONCLUSION 17

3. AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT IN ENGLISH 18

3.1 AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT IN ORDINARY CONVERSATION 18

3.1.1 PREFERENCE FEATURES 18

3.1.2 AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT SHAPES 19

3.1.2.1 Agreements With Agreements Preferred 20

3.1.2.2 Disagreements With Agreements Preferred 21

3.1.2.3 Agreement with Disagreement Preferred 22

3.1.2.4 Disagreement with Disagreement preferred 23

3.1.3 ESCALATING DISAGREEMENT 23

3.1.4 EXITING DISAGREEMENT 24

3.1.5 CONCLUSION 24

3.2 AGREEMENT/DISAGREEMENT IN INTERVIEWS 25

3.2.1 PREFERENCE FEATURES 25

3.2.2 AGREEMENT IN THE INTERVIEW 30

3.2.2.1 Token Agreement 31

3.2.2.2 Agreement in the Call-in Radio Show 32

3.2.2.3 Agreement, Neutrality, and Perspective 34

3.2.3 DISAGREEMENT IN THE INTERVIEW 35

3.2.3.1 Interviewer disagreement 36

3.2.3.2 Interviewee Disagreement 41

3.2.3.3 Disagreement between Interviewer and Interviewee 41

3.2.3.4 Disagreement between Interviewees 43

3.2.3.5 Disagreement in the Call-in Radio Show 44

3.2.4 ESCALATING DISPUTES 46

3.2.5 EXITING DISPUTES 47

3.2.6 CONCLUSION 47

CHAPTER 2 – METHODOLOGY 50

1. FRAMEWORK: CONVERSATION ANALYSIS 50

1.1 HISTORY AND DEFINITION 51

1.2 STANDARD PROCEDURE 53

1.3 ORDINARY CONVERSATION VERSUS INSTITUTIONAL INTERACTION 56

1.4 FOCUS OF RESEARCH IN INSTITUTIONAL INTERACTION 57

2. CORPUS 58

2.1 CONTEXTUALLY RELEVANT DETAILS OF INTERVIEWS 60

2.1.1 DECEMBER 3 INTERVIEW: "RELATIONS BETWEEN RUSSIA, CHINA, AND INDIA" 60

2.1.2 DECEMBER 4 INTERVIEW: "RUSSIA – INDIA" 61

2.1.3 MARCH 20 INTERVIEW: "THE SUPPRESSION OF THE MORALE OF IRAQI SOLDIERS IS THE MAIN AIM OF THE FIRST STAGE OF MILITARY OPERATIONS AGAINST IRAQ" 63

2.1.4 MARCH 21 INTERVIEW: "HOW DOES THE WAR IN IRAQ INFLUENCE THE INTERNAL SITUATION IN THE USA" 64

2.2 RADIO MAYAK 65

3. METHODOLOGY 66

CHAPTER 3 – ANALYSIS 70

1. OUTLINE 70

2. AGREEMENTS 73

2.1 WEAK AGREEMENTS 73

2.1.1 Agreement Via the IR 73

2.1.2 Affiliation 74

2.1.3 Agreement with Disagreement Preface 77

2.1.4 Token Agreement 78

2.1.5 Downgrading 79

2.2 Strong Agreements 80

2.2.1 Direct Agreement 80

2.2.2 Upgrading 82

2.2.3 Same Evaluation 84

3. DISAGREEMENTS 85

3.1 Weak Disagreements 85

3.1.1 Qualified Disagreement 86

3.1.2 Disagreement With Repair 87

3.1.3 Weak Contradiction 88

3.1.4 Disagreement with Agreement Preface 89

3.2 Strong Disagreements 91

3.2.5 Direct Disagreement 91

3.2.6 Strong Contradiction 92

3.2.7 Disagreement By Question 93

CHAPTER 4 - DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION 95

1. DISCUSSION 95

1.1 COLLABORATION SEQUENCES 96

1.1.1 NO DISPUTE 96

1.1.1.1 Affiliation Sequences 96

1.1.1.2 Manipulation Sequences 101

1.1.2 PRACTICAL DISPUTE 105

1.2 OPPOSITION SEQUENCES 109

1.2.1 MODERATE DISPUTE 109

1.2.2 INTENSE DISPUTE 113

1.2.3 PLACEMENT ON THE CONTINUUM OF COLLABORATION ~ OPPOSITION 120

2. CONCLUSION 125

REFERENCES 131

APPENDIX 1 – TRANSCRIPTION NOTATION 135

APPENDIX 2 – GLOSSARY OF TERMS 137

CHAPTER 1 – REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1. Introduction

1.1 Language and Culture

National identity is a pervasive concept that can manifest itself in many aspects of a group of individuals. One area where the national identity of a group is particularly visible is in its discourse. This idea has long been studied and debated by linguists and cultural studies scholars. Yokochi & Hall (2001, 17) maintain that "national identity is marked, distinct and salient within the discourse of some groups", and Giles and Coupland have demonstrated that "culture defines

how language should be used, and language helps to create and preserve the culture" (Van Dijk, 1997, vol. 1, 92). Many studies focus on the differences between Western and Asian cultures and their patterns of discourse, where a contrast of individualistic versus collectivistic ideology can be found (Canary, Cody, and Manusov, 2000; Scollon & Scollon, 2001, Yokochi & Hall, 2001; Collier, 2001). However, as very little research of this nature has been conducted on Russian language discourse, it has not been established to any great degree how culture manifests itself in certain features of this language. To begin answering questions about the culturally specific aspects of Russian language use, this study will look at agreement and disagreement in Russian in the context of the news interview.

Studies in this area are becoming increasingly relevant in the world today as Russia increases her foreign contacts in the West via economics and business, as well as through continuing to express her voice in the international organizations where she plays a role (e.g., United Nations Security Council, Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, G-8). A better understanding of Russian language discourse and how it compares with the discourse of other cultures can lead to enhanced effectiveness in cross-cultural media relations, diplomatic negotiations and conflict management. This study will serve as a preliminary investigation to begin answering some of the questions surrounding the culturally specific features of the Russian language, specifically with regards to agreement and disagreement strategies.

Agreement and disagreement are particularly important features as their expression can show the presence or absence of solidarity, cooperation, affiliation, or a desire to work together with someone towards the achievement of a common goal. Therefore, if someone wants to express agreement but is not understood properly, it could lead to doubts of that person's desire to cooperate and affiliate. Or, if someone wants to disagree delicately so as not to offend but is not understood, communication and cooperation could also break down.

This taken in the context of the news interview could have serious consequences. It would for instance be unfortunate if a Russian minister, in an interview on CNN broadcast live to several different nations on the topic of Russia vetoing a second UN resolution on military action against Iraq, were viewed as being argumentative and uncooperative. That could shape the opinions of the viewers on the intentions and the nature of the Russian minister and, by the generalizations that individuals so often make, on the intentions and nature of the Russian government and people in general. It is thus important that we obtain a clearer understanding of Russian language discourse and communicative styles, particularly as they exist in the media.

Gaining a greater understanding of these questions as they relate to intercultural differences will allow us to hypothesize about intercultural communication. If manipulation techniques, the encoding of preference features, and expressions of agreement/disagreement[1] are similar in Russian and Anglo-Western settings, we can expect minimal difficulties in intercultural

---

[1] For terminology, see Appendix 2 – Glossary of Terms.

communication. However, if these discourse strategies differ we can expect miscommunication in the interview and perhaps also in diplomatic encounters and negotiations, which could lead to the misrepresentation of key individuals' agendas and persons. This could hamper the achievement of the goals set by these encounters and, by extension, Russian-Anglo-Western relations in general. Recognizing these key differences, however, could lead to a better understanding of how and why each side represents themselves and their agenda.

1.2 Outline

Before looking at agreement and disagreement strategies in the Russian interview and how these strategies compare with their English counterparts, the following need to be clarified: English interview norms and standards, Russian interview norms and standards, English agreement and disagreement strategies, and Russian agreement and disagreement strategies. The first three areas have been widely researched, and thus summaries of their relevant details will be provided in sections 2 and 3 (respectively) of this chapter. As Russian agreement and disagreement strategies have not been researched, they will be outlined in the Analysis (Chapter 3). Details of the methodology used to determine Russian agreement and disagreement will be given in Chapter 2. The thesis concludes with the Discussion and Conclusion (Chapter 4).

2. The News Interview in Russia and the West

This section will give a brief summary of some of the key points surrounding Russian and Anglo-Western[2] news interviews, and discuss some of the socio-historical perspectives which have shaped them into what they are today.

2.1 English Interview Conventions

In today's Western world the news interview is one of the most popular formats for news distribution. The interview has been in a state of evolution since its inception, in part because of technological advances, and in part because the privatization of broadcast companies has increased competition. The media conglomerates that have taken over broadcasting companies previously owned by the government are doing all that is in their power to ensure that production costs are low and that viewer ratings are high. This has changed the ethos of broadcasting; now it is often the case that producers are most concerned with the liveliness of their shows, as this is what will attract viewers and generate greater profit.

Furthermore, now that the news interview is under the public eye, and as it contains valuable footage of journalists extracting statements of policy and other official information from key public figures, it has become an important object of social scientific study. Whereas in the past statements of officials were given to the public via a highly rehearsed narration organized on principles of rhetoric,

---

[2] From henceforth in, the term Anglo-Western will be used to denote that which pertains to English spoken in Western countries.

now question and answer is the vehicle for their statements. Therefore, public figures have had to change their skills from being highly versed in rhetoric and story telling, and focus on how to effectively answer questions.

This format can be challenging for both the interviewer (IR) and the interviewee (IE). For the IE, the interview is largely unscripted and hence unpredictable. Their ability to answer questions to the satisfaction of the public in news interviews and press conferences greatly affects their careers. The figures who can stay on their toes while answering questions will prosper and gain the respect of the public (Margaret Thatcher, John Kennedy) and those who cannot will be criticized (Ronald Reagan, John Major) (Clayman and Heritage, 2002, 3).

For the IR, the challenge lies in the devising of the questions. Question design can create biased yet exciting questions with an adversarial tone, or neutral yet uninteresting questions. It is important to strike a balance between the two extremes, and formulate questions with the desired combination of adversarialness and neutrality. This desired combination results in the ideal – questions that are both neutral and interesting. This fact makes question design the "cutting edge of broadcast journalism" (Clayman and Heritage, 2002, 189). The outcome of achieving the balance between adversarialness and neutrality is that the audience will remain engaged while receiving a more unbiased presentation of the facts. If the balance is not achieved, however, the audience will be unsatisfied with the quality of the interview, which will in turn affect the career of the IR and the popularity of that broadcasting station. As profit is the main motivating force behind the vast majority of media stations, and as not

meeting this balance can jeopardize this profit, the desired combination of adversarialness and neutrality is highly sought.

The two main types of interviews in the west are solo interviews and panel interviews. Typically, panel interviews have less distinguished guests – the more distinguished public figures tend to go solo. Over the past 50 years the panel interview has become more popular. This is due to the greater ease at which the balance of adversarialness and neutrality can be achieved with this form. With two IEs, the IR does not have to play the role of devil's advocate, but can present the two IEs with an issue that could generate adversarialness, sit back, and leave the debating to them. Also, from the point of view of the audience, the panel interview is livelier as it typically has two guests from different ideological standpoints debating two sides of an issue.

In solo interviews, IRs have the problem of making sure their questions are neutralistic. It is their job on the one hand to keep ideological balance in the interview, but often playing devil's advocate can indicate a certain bias – that is, the interview's expressions could be attributed as the interviewer's own personal opinions. In panel interviews that problem is somewhat solved as the IEs provide the ideological extremes, but here IRs have to worry about neutrality in a different form, namely the balanced treatment of panelists.

2.2 Russian news interview ideologies/values

While Western broadcasting companies are largely driven by wide profit margins and high viewer ratings, in Russia there is a long history of the media being managed to educate the public with the ideologies of the government. This

started as far back as imperialist Russia, when the authorities had control over which newspapers would be circulated, which values they would contain, and how much funding they would receive (Vartanova, 2001, 65). This practice continued into Soviet times, when the state used the media as its primary means of instilling and disseminating their values, and maintaining a measure of control over the people. Vartanova states:

> **"[i]n the traditional 'family', as Russian society can be portrayed, the role of the respectable decision-making father has often been performed by the political elite while the pre-revolutionary press, or the Soviet and even the post-Soviet media, often behaved as an innocent and obedient child." (66)**

In Soviet times it was strictly forbidden to disagree with the media, as it embodied the state's ideology, leaving no room for differing viewpoints.

The media remained an instrument for voicing the state ideology through to 1986 when Mikhail Gorbachev began introducing *glasnost*. He sought to use the media to re-tell Soviet history, exposing the evils of Stalin's regime and creating an environment in which debate and criticism would flourish. To do this he had to persuade journalists to abandon their self-censorship and feel free to challenge their country's leadership (McNair, 1994, 116). The media gradually caught on to this change, and new publications began to emerge which furthered this openness (e.g., *Московские Новости*) (ibid, 117). Although it may appear at first glance as though this procedure was in fact creating more objectivity and freedom in the press, the socialist and democratic governments had similar objectives – to disseminate the state's ideology to the people via the media. The

difference under Gorbachev was merely the content of that ideology, which stated that people should criticize the old regime and engage in debate.

If was not long before conservative elements in the government began to strongly voice their desire to return the media to its previous state (or, return society to its old values). To combat this, in 1990 the Russian government passed a media law that ended the Communist Party's monopoly on media outlets. This coincided with a furthering of the *glasnost* process to include the concept of 'liberal pluralism' – the right to question the working of the Communist Party (McNair, 1994, 118). The media law combined with the new policy of pluralism created an influx of new publications by various groups representing differing ideologies (for example, *Независимая Газета* and publications by the Christian Democrats).

With the fall of communism and the introduction of a free market economy a year later, the Russian media had the new task of adapting to this new societal structure both politically and economically. Various changes to the media resulted; Vartanova (2001, 24) cites three. First was the replacement of a preference for print media by the dominance of television and radio. This was a result of both financial factors, such as the costliness of newspapers, and social factors, such as increasing disappointment in politicians and institutions. Secondly, the structure of media outlets has changed. Whereas in Soviet times the rights, ownership, and authority over the content of the broadcasts were in the hands of a select few, now more individuals are a part of the production process. This is due in part to the emergence of a local market. While in Soviet times the

media was very centralized, in the 1990's Russia witnessed the emergence of several local media stations that broadcast regional as well as national news. Thirdly, with the emergence of the new market economy, advertising and competition now play key roles. This has resulted in the fragmentation of the Russian audience (as advertising creates target groups) and a greater choice among media outlets.

Since Vladimir Putin came into power in 2000, the media has regained some of its Soviet-era characteristics. Criticism of the government on television is becoming rare, as the two independent networks (NTV, ORT) that Kremlin opponents once controlled are now under government influence. This came about after state-connected shareholders performed takeovers of the networks in 2001. Russia's only independent radio station that broadcast news across the country, Ekho Moskvy, was also the victim of a takeover performed by the same state-connected shareholders. Media critics in Russia (Yasen Zassoursky, Vladimir Ryzhkov) are concerned that this could be the beginning of a dangerous trend that sees the demise of the freedom of the press in Russia through the silencing of those media outlets that do not support the government (LaFraniere, 2002).

2.2.1 State Owned Russian Radio

As this study analyzes interview shows taken from Radio Mayak, a member of the state owned VGTRK (All-Russian State Television and Radio Committee), I will now turn to state owned media. The VGTRK has been increasingly prominent in Russian society since the second Chechen war (starting in 1999). It contains seven sections of news assigned to the seven federal districts that

president Putin recently created to strengthen his management of the country (Zassoursky, 2001, 164).

Although the VGTRK does not have a large number of media outlets, the work it does is large scale and far reaching. The two television channels that are run by the VGTRK cover more territory than the commercial channels, and are available in each region of Russia. The government uses this coverage to use the media as an instrument to exert some measure of control over the people via its contents. The present structure of Russia, divided into its 7 regions, is a strategic move by President Putin to strengthen the government's rule over the large country. The media is a kind of control mechanism over these regions, where the people can be influenced by national television and news agencies (Zassoursky, 2001, 164).

Soviet radio was typically very formal and centralized, leaving no room for creativity and giving a very small amount of airtime to local programming. This gave radio a negative reputation, lessening its popularity among the Soviet people as a form of media. For this reason, in the past Russian media researchers did not focus much on radio as compared to other forms of media (V[illegible]anova, 2001, 52). In present day Russia, however, radio is losing its Soviet-era reputation and becoming quite popular. In 1999, a survey printed in *Sredstva massovoj informatsii Rossii: auditorija i reklama* found that 82% of Russians listened to the radio, making it more popular than television (which 80% of the population watched). The same survey also found that 76.9% of the population

was satisfied with what they heard on the radio, whereas only 65% were satisfied with television (Vartanova, 2001, 52).

2.3 Conclusion

In sum, there are two main differences between Russian and Western radio. Firstly, one key role of radio in Western settings is audience entertainment. The more audiences find shows entertaining, the greater the profits the broadcasting station will generate. In Russia, however, state owned radio has in Soviet times performed and still continues to some extent to perform more of a didactic role. This is due in part to the absence of a free market economy for much of Russia's recent history, and thus more of a focus on the radio station's objectives (instilling government ideology) than on audience entertainment.

Secondly, in the West we have traditionally had much more choice in radio stations, and thus more choice in the point of view from which we wish to hear our news. In Russia, however, under Soviet rule all radio was government owned and controlled, giving the people only one point of view from which to listen to the news. While in the 1990's this situation changed, becoming more similar to the Western model, since the early 2000's Russian radio has become more homogeneous.

These differences raise the question of how Russians would react to Western-style media. While giving an interview in a Western setting, would a Russian official be affected by the element of adversarialness present and, if so, would this affect the Western viewers' perceptions of them? How would this affect the communication between the IR and the IE, and thus the achievement of

the goals of the interview? These questions cannot be answered without a better understanding of Russian language discourse in the news interview, and how it can be compared with the norms of news interviews conducted in English.

3. Agreement and Disagreement in English

The following section will outline English agreement and disagreement strategies and conventions in the contexts of Ordinary Conversation (OC) and the News Interview. The key points of these features in each context that will be outlined are preference features, agreement and disagreement types, escalating disagreement, and exiting disagreement[3].

3.1 Agreement and Disagreement in Ordinary Conversation

3.1.1 Preference Features

In her article "Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments," Pomerantz (1984, 57) states that speakers, when providing assessments, invite their hearers to either agree or disagree. The invitation may be performed linguistically, by using a certain structure (e.g., a negative interrogative), or contextually, in which case the social context may indicate whether it is more acceptable for the second speaker to agree or disagree. While the use of the linguistic type of invitation is optional in conversation, the latter type exists in all situations, as one cannot avoid context. If the response is invited it is called a 'preferred next action'. If it is not

[3] Please consult the Glossary (Appendix 2) for explanations of the technical terms used.

invited, it is a 'dispreferred next action'. This is important, as the preference status of an action may affect how the action is performed.

3.1.2 Agreement and Disagreement Shapes

When applying preference features to OC, several combinations result: agreement with agreement preferred, agreement with disagreement preferred, disagreement with disagreement preferred, and disagreement with agreement preferred.

Some general characteristics of agreement and disagreement in OC are as follows:

i) Agreement can be either weak or strong. Strong agreement is most common, and consists of only agreement components. Weak agreement, on the other hand, contains both agreement and disagreement components (e.g., A: "I like chocolate." B: "I like chocolate too, but I think vanilla is better.").

ii) Disagreement can also be either weak or strong. Weak disagreement is most common, and consists also of agreement components, silence, requests for clarification, or delay mechanisms (see section 3.1.2.2 for specific details).

iii) Agreements and their preceding utterances are generally separated by a minimal time interval, while disagreements are often delayed (Pomerantz, 1984, 60).

In the following section I will discuss these characteristics of agreement and disagreement in terms of how they occur in the above stated combinations, and how preference features are encoded into the first assessment.

3.1.2.1 Agreements With Agreements Preferred

To agree one must provide a second assessment that is consistent with the first assessment. Within this, however, there are variations:

i) Upgrading – the second assessment gives a stronger evaluation than the first, or includes a modifier that increases the intensity (e.g., "very", "really"). Upgrading shows strong agreement. Strong agreements usually minimize the time interval between first and second assessments – in some cases they even overlap.

ii) Same evaluation – the first assessment is repeated, and "also" or "too" is added or the verb is restated. This can also occur in disagreement, but in that case will be followed with "but" (e.g., A: "Tokyo is a beautiful city – I'd love to live there." B: "I think it's beautiful too, but I could never live there.") Same evaluations are weak agreement.

iii) Downgrading – the second assessment gives a weaker agreement than the first by decreasing the intensity of the modifiers (e.g., A: "Edmonton is great!" B: "It's okay."). In this case, the speaker will often follow the downgrade with an upgrade to counteract ensuing disagreement. These are also weak agreement, in that they can imply an ensuing disagreement (Pomerantz, 1984, 68).

Strong agreement is the most common response when agreement is preferred. Therefore, upgrading is a common type of agreement. Same evaluations and downgrading are relatively less common when agreement is preferred as they constitute weak agreement (which is less preferred than strong agreement).

3.1.2.2 Disagreements With Agreements Preferred

When agreement is preferred, disagreement is not a common response. If it does occur, however, it is most likely to be in its weak form. Weak disagreement can be constructed in one of two ways: as a disagreement component preceded by delay devices, or as disagreement components preceded by agreement prefaces.

In the case of delay devices, the second speaker can chose to offer no immediately forthcoming talk (i.e., silence), repair itiniators (e.g.,"What?" "Hmm?" "You do?" etc.) or delayed disagreement within the turn. The latter usually start with something that displays reluctance (e.g., "uh", "well", "actually"). With silence as a delay device, it is common for the first speaker to anticipate disagreement and resume talking, making modifications to lessen the differences between their positions and the presumed disagreeing position.

Agreement prefaces use the contrasting conjunction "but" to join the agreement and disagreement components. Both the agreement in the preface and the disagreements following are usually weak, the latter existing either as:

i) Tokens (e.g., A: "Green is the best for you." B: "I know, but I want red.")

ii) Asserted agreements, in which part of the first assessment is restated, and then followed by ["but" + disagreement] (e.g., A: "You could use one of these. And they're really pretty." B: "They're pretty, but I don't need one.")

iii) Weakened and /or qualified agreement assertions (e.g., A: "It's fast." B: "Pretty fast.").

Strong disagreement is even less common when agreement is preferred. When it does occur, however, it is directly contrastive with the first assessment, and does not exist in combination with agreement components (Pomerantz, 1984, 74) (e.g., A: "Linguistics is so fascinating." B: "It is not! It's very boring.").

3.1.2.3 Agreement with Disagreement Preferred

In OC, agreement with disagreement preferred usually occurs in response to self-deprecating statements. As this involves the second speaker criticizing the first speaker, they are dispreferred action turns. Evidence of this can be seen in the fact that they occur where a criticism is withheld until the first speaker says something self-deprecating, after which the second speaker agrees with their comment and then proceeds to criticize them. The criticism is usually "weak", often being stated with a contrastive, prefacing remark.

Two common varieties of agreement with disagreement preferred are a) claims of access to the same referent by the speaker ascribing the self-deprecating comment to themselves as well (e.g., A: "I'm so lazy." B: "Me too."), and b) weak confirmation of the first assessment (e.g., A: "I was just being used!" B: "I suppose.").

Sometimes the second speaker will neither agree nor disagree. This can be done by silence, or by acknowledgement tokens (e.g., "hmm", "umm") instead of explicit agreement. It is interesting that silence is usually interpreted as the dispreferred alternative. As stated above, when silence follows an utterance to which agreement is preferred, it is interpreted as disagreement. Likewise, when silence follows disagreement it is interpreted as agreement (Pomerantz, 1984, 92-3).

3.1.2.4 Disagreement with Disagreement preferred

In the case of disagreement with disagreement preferred in OC, the disagreement is usually strong. It may take one of the following forms:

i) Partial repeats (e.g., A: "Are you bored?" B: "Bored? No, I'm having a great time!")

ii) Negations (e.g., A: "Am I fat?" B: "No, you're soo thin.")

iii) Compliments (e.g., A: "I'm a bad runner." B: "I think you're very athletic.").

(Pomerantz, 1984, 83-5)

In sum, regardless of the particular combination of agreement or disagreement, what is common in English is what is preferred. Strong agreement or disagreement usually occurs when it is the preferred response, while if a second speaker wishes to make a dispreferred response it will usually take the weak form.

3.1.3 Escalating disagreement

Greatbatch (1992 in) found that when dispreferred responses are given in OC the talk will often escalate into an argument. This can occur by the speakers

not using all mitigation features (delay devices and agreement prefaces). So, instead of weakly disagreeing through the use of mitigation features where agreement is preferred, participants will strongly disagree by upgrading and minimizing the time interval between the first and second assessments. This process usually starts with silences and the withholding of tokens, and escalates when interactants express themselves more boldly.

This is not common in OC, where speakers are generally reluctant to get into disagreements. They usually forestall disputes, and when they do engage in them they rarely do so at full-force, and the intensity and length of the disagreement are generally limited. (Clayman and Heritage, 2002, 311)

3.1.4 Exiting disagreement

Greatbatch's study (1992) found that exiting from disputes is usually negotiated by a moderation of the prior disagreement. This can be done by qualifiers ("I think"), claiming limited knowledge to the subject of the dispute, or by giving a passing turn (a turn with no topical content, the purpose being to change the topic or close interaction: e.g., "well, anyways…"). Usually the disagreeing party will initiate the exit. Moderation is characteristic of OC disagreement. This is largely because in OC everything has to be negotiated (exiting, changing topics) and there is much work to clean up after a messy argument.

3.1.5 Conclusion

In sum, in OC preferred responses are the most common. When dispreferred responses are given, they are usually of the weak variety and are

preceded by delay devices or agreement/disagreement prefaces. Dispreferred disagreements escalate into disputes when they cease to gain strength through the omission of mitigation features (delay devices and agreement prefaces). Disputes are uncommon in OC in Anglo-Western societies, and are usually brief. They usually come to a close as the party who initiated the dispute moderates their stance (Greatbach, 1992; Pomerantz, 1984).

3.2 Agreement/Disagreement in Interviews

This section illustrates how preference features and agreement and disagreement operate in the news interview. While in some respects these devices are similar to their counterparts in OC, in many ways their conventions are quite different. How these differences relate to the goals of the interview and the roles of the IR and the IE will be discussed in the following sections.

3.2.1 Preference Features

In the setting of the interview adversarial conduct is much more welcome than in OC as disagreement is not as dispreferred, and dispreferred responses are not avoided as often. When dispreferred responses do occur they are not usually mitigated or delayed, but executed promptly. This is a result of both the nature of the value of disagreement here (exciting, newsworthy interviews have elements of disagreement), as well as the structure (in the case of the panel interview[4]). Preference features are also redundant in non-mediated disagreement, since if

[4] Mitigation and delay is somewhat redundant in the panel interview, as the IEs are not in direct interaction. Indeed their responses are directed to the IR, not to the co-IE, and there is no need to use these devices (see section 3.2.3.4 for details).

disagreement is not mediated a conflict is usually already escalating. This becomes apparent when contrasted with the norm for interview interaction, when conflict is not escalating and IE remarks to one another are fielded through the IR. When the structure IR-IE-IR-IE is broken, it usually means that a conflict is ensuing, and people are not bound by the same desires to avoid dispreferred responses. And if interview participants are not noting which responses are dispreferred, preference features become redundant (Clayman and Heritage, 2002, 312).

Preference features are more useful for the IR than for the IE. This is due to the roles that the IR and IE adhere to, which state that the IR asks the questions and the IE responds. While the questioner is able to encode preference features in their utterances, the responder – when adhering to their main role of responding – only answers to the preference features and does not ask questions or make first assessments. In theory this puts the IE in a very passive role, at the whim of the questions the IR chooses to ask and of how they chose to ask them. This is the advantage of the IR, who otherwise is somewhat limited due to their vow of neutrality: questions are produced under the pretence of being neutral as the IR is supposedly impartial, merely divulging information from the IE for the benefit of the audience (Clayman and Heritage, 2002, 312).

In this discussion on preference features in the interview I will consider manipulation techniques of IRs as a larger category of actions, which also include preference features. Clayman and Heritage (2002, 192-237) outline the ways in which interview questions are manipulative, stating that they:

i) Set topical areas which establish agendas. Setting the topicality as the first part of an adjacency pair makes not answering on the selected topic an accountable action. This has serious repercussions for public figures, who will thus be seen as evasive or incompetent.

ii) Define at what length the IE should respond.

iii) Establish the category of speech act that the IE must perform. For example, if an IR asks a question that demands either agreement or disagreement, the IE must restrict their response to one of those two statements or they will be accused of not answering the question.

iv) Contain preference features, which show the IR's preference for which precise speech act they want the IE to perform. While the IR will establish the category of speech act that must be performed, within that there are sometimes choices as to which specific variety of that act to use (e.g., the IE must either agree or disagree, and the IR prefers that they disagree). As this point is most central to the topic of agreement/disagreement, it will be discussed here at greater length. Pressure is exerted on the IE by preference features that make one kind of response desirable and the other undesirable. The IR does this by treating alternative responses as non-equivalent. The more interviewers use preference features, the more their neutralistic stance may be compromised. Clayman and Heritage (2002, 208-217) outline the following ways in which preference features can be encoded into questions:

a) Negative Interrogatives - Despite their interrogative syntax, this form is often treated as an assertion, not as a question. Their assertive status in production was evidenced in a study performed by Heritage (2002), which showed how IRs corrected themselves by switching from negative interrogatives to positive interrogatives, admitting that the negative would be too declamatory and not questioning enough, as in the following:

"[Senate Judiciary Committee Hearings 8 December, 1998]

1 Sen: Now lemme ask you this Mister Davis,
2 (1.5)
3 Sen: Would you:; (0.8) I started to say wouldn't you, but then I'd be
4 speaking for you. Would you acknowledge that this committee's..."

(Heritage, 2002, 1431)

Heritage's study also found that negative interrogatives are most often responded to with agreement or disagreement. As agreement and disagreement do not logically follow questions, this shows how negative interrogatives are more interpretable as assertions than as questions. The following example illustrates this point:

"[Presidential Press Conference: 7 March 1997]

1 IR: W'l Mister President in your zea:l (.) for funds during the last
2 campaign .hh didn't you put the Vice President (.) an' Maggie and all the 3 others in your (0.4) administration top side .hh in a very vulnerable 4 position, hh
5 (0.5)
6 IE: I disagree with that."
(Heritage, 2002, 1432)

IR utterances containing negative interrogatives have a very strong preference for agreement (over disagreement). In the same study performed by Heritage (2002), it was shown how agreement was the response given to negative interrogatives for the overwhelming majority of the responses, even when that agreement supported a negative criticism of oneself. In this sense negative interrogatives are the means by which an IR can elicit an expected answer so predictably that an IE will agree even when doing so damages their reputation.

As negative interrogatives are actually assertions in the syntactic guise of questions, they are rather unfair and extremely non-neutral. IRs can structure these forms in such a way that agreement will cause the IE to give a defamatory remark, while safely assuming that the IE will nonetheless agree. This gives the IR a tool to manipulate the IE into projecting a negative self-portrayal to their audience. Furthermore, the IR always has the defense that they are only asking a question, and as this is their role and right in the interview, they cannot be held accountable.

b) Tag questions - These also show preference for a certain type of answer (a "yes" answer) in that the assertion portion of the question describes something, and the tag portion invites confirmation. Tag questions can also be used by the IR to promote IE acceptance of statements, as they prefer affiliation with the assertion portion of the question. Although they do not project this preference as strongly as negative interrogatives they divulge preferred responses more consistently (Heritage, 210, 2002).

Whereas negative interrogatives strongly prefer agreement, tag questions prefer "yes" answers.

c) Negative polarity terms (e.g., "any", "never") and positive polarity terms (e.g., "seriously, really") show preference for "no" answers. These terms arre often used in questions that contrast with the known position of the IE, and they thus are challenges to defend their position.

In sum, IR-questions can be manipulative when they set topical areas, define at what length the IE should respond, and influence speech acts performed. Common preference features are negative interrogatives, tag questions, and positive and negative polarity terms. As questions could be asked without using any of the above preference features, their very presence indicates some kind of an agenda, such as to challenge the IE, or manipulate them into answering in a certain way (Clayman and Heritage, 2002, 209).

3.2.2 Agreement in the Interview

Turn taking in interviews is constrained by the question-answer format, which reinforces IR and IE roles and provides for the accomplishment of their goals to elicit and provide information. These goals are normally fulfilled to the extent that over 85% of IR utterances are questions. Given this, the IE is not often in a position to agree with the IR, since you can not agree with questions (Greatbatch, 1992).

Various studies (Greatbatch, 1992, Clayman and Heritage, 2002, Clayman, 2002, Heritage, 2000) found that IR agreement is also not common. The

IR avoids both explicit agreement as well as token agreement, as such behavior would forfeit their neutrality and alter the structure of the interview format where the audience (as opposed to the IE) is the primary addressee. By avoiding agreement and keeping the audience as the primary addressee, the IR shows their orientation to the institutional nature of the interaction – their role of eliciting information for an overhearing audience.

What this amounts to is that in theory, there would not be a lot of agreement in an interview. Aside from refraining from agreeing due to the preference for an element of adversarialness over harmony, IRs cannot agree due to neutrality issues and IEs cannot agree due to structural reasons (they are answering questions). The exceptions to this, of course, are with tag questions and negative interrogatives. Given this, it is still important to discuss the meanings and interpretations of interview agreement, so when the norms of the interview are not met, we will have a clearer understanding of the devices that make it so.

The following sections discuss possible varieties of agreement in the news interview and the call-in radio show, looking at these conventions mainly from the points of view of the IR and their neutrality.

3.2.2.1 Token Agreement

There are two types of tokens: continuative tokens, which show that the speaker has more to say (e.g., "mm hm", "uh huh", "yes"), and acknowledgment tokens, which show that the listener supports, agrees with, and finds interesting or informative what is being said (e.g., "oh", "really", "did you").

Acknowledgment tokens are withheld by the IR as they can be said to show support, and therefore are non-neutralistic. While these tokens are commonly used in agreement in OC, they are generally avoided in the interview.

Continuers (e.g., "mm hm", "uh huh", "yes") are a little more complex. In OC, they manage the turn taking in that each participant is allotted one turn of talk before the turn changes. If one participant uses a continuer they are ceding their turn, and allowing the speaker to continue. In the news interview, however, this rule does not apply. Here, the IE does not get a turn until asked a question. Thus, using continuers by the IE is actually a challenging move as it implies that the IE claims the right to a turn in the middle of the IR's talk – a right that does not coincide with the question-answer format. It has been found that continuers in the interview actually are hostile acts that precede argument and interview breakdowns. Thus, while IEs avoid tokens because of hostility, IRs avoid them because of addressee status and neutrality. (Clayman and Heritage, 2002, 112)

3.2.2.2 Agreement in the Call-in Radio Show

We have thus far contrasted OC with the news interview and highlighted the differences. We have seen that agreement and disagreement in each of these contexts represent the opposite ends of a spectrum – in OC agreement is generally preferred and preferred responses predominate, in contrast with the interview where disagreement is accepted or invited, and dispreferred responses are more common. There is a type of talk in the middle of these two, however: the call-in radio show. Sai Hua Kuo (1994) performed a study on a call-in radio show featuring a psychologist as the IR and a call-in patient as the IE. Here, where

neutrality was not as much of an issue, agreement was more common. The three agreement strategies of repetition, upgraded agreement, and token agreement was found to be most prominent. These can be described as follows:

i) Repetition - Brown and Levinson (1987) claim that through repeating an interlocutor's remarks, one shows that one heard correctly and that one emotionally agrees with what was said. Tannen (1987) pointed out that repetition shows acceptance of the other's utterance while responding, and thereby serves the interactional function of involvement and solidarity. Labov and Fanshel (1977) claim that statements can be broken down into A-events and B-events, each participant being knowledgeable about only about one of the two types. AB-events are known about by both participants. If A makes a statement about a B event, it is interpreted as needing a confirmation (e.g., Doctor: "You take everything seriously." Caller: " Everything") (Kuo, 1994, 99). In this interview, the caller confirms the psychologist's B remarks by repeating parts of his utterances.

ii) Upgraded agreement - This is also used to show solidarity and positive politeness. Two techniques used are intensifying modifiers (e.g., "Caller: That's right. You're absolutely right.") and stronger evaluative terms (e.g., "Caller: I feel terrible about myself") (Kuo, 1994, 100).

iii) Token Agreement – Here, positive acknowledgement tokens are shown to be weak agreement forms, as they are uttered independently of other forms to show understanding or support.

Throughout the show examined in Kuo's study, the caller uses repetition and upgraded agreement to reinforce the psychologist's remarks, while the psychologist agrees by using acknowledgement tokens (Kuo, 1994).

3.2.2.3 Agreement, Neutrality, and Perspective

Perspective has been studied by Jennifer Alber (2002), and can be described as one's personal point of view or orientation in the world. In communication we must try to take into account the other's perspective, so that we may better understand the context of what they are saying. The purpose of the news interview is for the IR to uncover the IE's perspective, but to do this they must tone down their own perspective. Alber (2002) found in her study of two television news interviews by Christiane Amanpour from September, 2000 that in one case (an interview with Ehud Barak) the IR toned down her perspective by talking less, using fewer hesitations, preferring second person pronouns over the first person, and by smooth turn transitions. In the other, more controversial interview with Yasser Arafat, this IR departed from the norm by speaking for almost half of the time, by answering a lot of the questions instead of asking them, by hesitating, and by using many first person singular pronouns. This did not allow her to uncover Arafat's perspective, and in that respect this interview could be said to have been unsuccessful. This is an example of how the structure of the interview, when altered to allow for IR agreement and disagreement,

becomes an ineffective means for achieving its goal of impartially eliciting information from an IE.

3.2.3 Disagreement in the Interview

Disagreement in the interview also differs significantly from its counterpart in OC. This can be explained by i) the structure of the interview, ii) the fact that disagreement is often preferred, and iii) the presence of a neutral overseer (i.e., the IR) to oversee any disputes that may arise.

i) Often disagreement between IEs is often addressed to the IR, not to the opposing party. This is facilitated by the structure of the interview, which provides for the IR to have the right to every second turn. Because of this, disagreement here is not mitigated by delay devices or by agreement prefaces, but by the mediation of the IR. This makes interview disagreement more direct than OC disagreement (Greatbatch, 1992, 279).

ii) As disagreement is more preferred in the interview, it is thus also not avoided to the same degree as in OC.

iii) When IEs enter into disagreement, they trust that the IR will stop the disagreement before their reputations are damaged, as this is one of the responsibilities of the IR. Naturally this responsibility is fulfilled only to varying degrees in some interviews; it is however technically the IR's role to maintain order and step in when the structure of the interview breaks down. In OC, on the other hand, the process of

getting out of a disagreement is much more complicated and the consequences more severe.

The subsequent sections 3.2.3.1 – 3.2.5 will discuss the above points i) to iii) from the points of view of both the IR and the IE, describing different disagreement shapes, how disputes escalate, and how they are typically exited.

3.2.3.1 Interviewer disagreement

As mentioned in section 3.2.2, over 85% of IR utterances are questions. This does not put the IR in a convenient position to disagree in solo interviews, as it is difficult to disagree using interrogative syntax. In panel interviews, however, where it is the IR's job to strike a balance between neutrality and adversarialness, they can somewhat freely *generate* disagreement between IEs. This is also due to the fact that the focus is not so much on the IR as it is on the interplay between the IEs. This leaves the IR free to be a catalyst to lively discussion and even debate by generating adversarialness between IEs. This strategy has advantages – the audience now has the chance to see public figures in action, pitted against each other, defending their points of view. This is in contrast to the past, when such news was presented to the public on the radio via summaries of narrations. On the other hand, however, when the journalist is marginalized and the emphasis is on conflict, these interviews run the risk of being more sensational than informative (Clayman and Heritage, 2002, 300).

IR's generate disagreement in the following ways:

i) Footing shifts - Clayman, in a study on footing shifts in the interview, used Irving Goffman's terminology to define footing shifts (1992, 164-165). Goffman broke down the roles of speakers and listeners into that of animator (the utterer), author (the composer of the words being uttered) and principal (the one whose viewpoint is being expressed). These three aspects of interactants' roles are 'footings', and a speaker in interaction assumes one or all of them. A footing shift, then, is when a speaker changes either the authorship or the principal of their remark. A synthetic example is as follows, the underlined segments indicating where a footing shift has occurred:

> IR: Now let's proceed with the interview. <u>As everyone knows</u>, the Kyoto Accord has been the cause of much controversy as of late. <u>In the words of Jane Smith</u>, it is "causing a rift in our government".

The choice of when and how to employ a footing shift is usually based on strategic principles, such as how to disclaim authorship in a timely fashion in order to distance oneself from an opinionated claim. This allows the IR to maintain their neutrality. This is evidenced in part by the fact that often footing shifts occur when assertions are being made, which constitutes times when neutrality is most needed.

Footing shifts allow the IR to generate disagreement in the solo interview as well as in the panel interview. They are especially common in panel interviews where the IEs represent different sides.

Footing shifts resulting in the reformulation of previous statements allow the IR to generate disagreement without collaborating with either side. This strategy targets a particular part of the statement, which can shape the conversation. The form of the footing shift does not have to be as explicit as a ["x says" + assertion], however; the assertion could precede the attribution, or, the attribution could be omitted altogether. This last case is used when the IR wishes to more hastily generate disagreement. The IR gets away with this by the proximity of their reformulation to the original statement, as well as by quoting the IE directly (Clayman, 1992, 174-176).

The following observations were made by Clayman and Heritage (2002, 152-176) on footing shifts:

a) Footing shifts usually occur as introductions to controversial statements. It is at these times that the IR needs to practise "special handling" (ibid, 170) of the language they are using, which they do by distancing themself from the authorship of those statements.

b) Footing shifts are renewed at controversial words. Before making a point that may spark some contention, speakers will often employ a footing shift to distance themselves from the authorship of the remark.

c) Footing shifts are often preceded by repair (the reformulation or retraction of a troublesome statement). Often the IR will be on the verge of making a non neutral statement, repair it, and then restate it under the authorship of someone else.

ii) Introduction of guests and topics - IRs can create more conflict by the manner in which they introduce the IEs and the topics to be discussed (whether they project a debate or a discussion). If the interview is introduced as a debate, the IR can frame the topic in a way that implies IE disagreement will be present in the interview.

iii) Non-conflictual versus conflictual questioning patterns (in the panel interview) - IRs invite interplay in various ways by designing their questions along an axis of conflict~non-conflict. At the non-conflictual end, the interview is carried out with each IE being questioned separately at length before the other is called on to speak (IR~IE1; IR~IE1; IR~IE2; IR~IE2). This keeps the IEs distant from each other, and thus minimizes disagreement. When disagreement does occur it is not as engaged and more indirect. So, if the IR wants to generate disagreement within this framework they reformulate prior turns of one IE's talk and pit them against the utterances of the other IE (Clayman and Heritage, 303). At the conflictual end of the axis a question is asked to each different IE in succession (IR~IE1; IR~IE2; IR~IE1; IR~IE2). This format has greater potential for disagreement,

and when disagreement occurs it is more confrontational as the IEs are more likely to be speaking to each other directly than they would be in the previous format (ibid, 304).

Within this framework there are different varieties of antagonistic question forms:

a) Least antagonistic – The IR asks different IEs to give opinions with the same speech act on the same topic. Here, whether IEs agree or disagree is not highlighted, as the content of their assessments are not pitted against each other. (e.g., IR: "What do you think about that?" IE: "I think its typical." IR: "And Mr. Brown?" IE: "I think it's interesting.")

b) More antagonistic - IEs are asked to comment on other IE's assessments, rather than comment on an issue (e.g., IR: "How do you feel about the war in Iraq, Mrs. White?" IE: "I think it's morally just." IR: "Mrs, Smith, do you feel the war is morally just? IE: "Most certainly not!").

c) Most antagonistic - IEs are not merely invited to comment on another IE's remark, but invited to disagree with it. This is done by preference features; the IR encourages IE1 down a path of disagreement by implying that they *will* disagree) (e.g., IR: "Do you think the war is morally just, or only just in the economic sense?")

d) Subtly - An IE's previous remark is reformulated, omitting hedges and other softening features to make it more direct and confrontational. The preference feature here is the question's more extreme and thus more disagreeable wording. It also polarizes the topic to a greater degree, making the overall mood more adversarial by showing the extreme sides of it (Clayman and Heritage, 1992, 305-8).

3.2.3.2 Interviewee Disagreement

Two types of IE disagreement are considered here: disagreement between the IE and IR, in which case the IE has attacked the IR, and disagreement between IEs (in a panel interview).

3.2.3.3 Disagreement between Interviewer and Interviewee

Clayman and Heritage state that an IE can attack an IR in two ways – as an attack on a question preface (the assertion portion of an utterance which precedes the question), and as an attack on IR conduct. Attacks on IR conduct are particularly problematic, as it is difficult for the IR to repair such a situation. If they defend their conduct, they will have to abandon their neutrality, "which is the hallmark of the professional interviewer" (Clayman and Heritage, 2002, 143). On the other hand, if they do not defend their conduct the audience will see them as guilty for what they are accused of. The solution commonly adopted in response

to this tricky situation is for the IR to justify their remark by stating that they were only performing their role and asking a question.

Attacks on question prefaces are also problematic as they can seriously affect the outcome of the interview. Firstly, they delay the production of the question, and second, they treat the IR's remark as an expression of opinion rather than relevant background information that is leading to a question. This kind of early disagreement is highly dispreferred, and thus makes the disagreement more serious as it could draw the IR into an argument (which would abandon both the format of the interview and the IR's neutrality). To avoid this, ideally the IR will generate another question with a neutral object to bring the interview back on track. This kind of attack on third party question prefaces are rare, but question prefaces which are not attributed to a third party are fairly common (Clayman and Heritage, 2002, 142).

It is also possible for an IR to attack an IE. This was discussed in Clayman, 2002, using the example of an interview conducted in 1985 by Lesley Stahl for the Sunday morning public affairs program Face the Nation (CBS). This was a panel interview, in which one of the guests (here referred to as JR) was repetitively attacked and treated unfairly, while the other (here referred to as AC) was favored.

The interview discussed in Clayman, 2002 contains IR bias and attacks in the following areas:

1. The introductions – JR is introduced merely as an author, while AC is introduced with a long line of credentials. This occurs despite the face that JR also has credentials.
2. The questioning – Some of JR's statements are challenged by the IR.
3. The use of acknowledgement tokens - The IR uses tokens during AC's talk, but not during JC's talk. This enhances the sense of IR favoritism towards AC.
4. Interplay between panelists – The IR asks JR questions, and then invites AC to respond. This is unfair, as AC always has the final word. This, however, is only part of the problem. The designs of some of the IR's questions also show bias, such as invitations that solicit disagreement in general (e.g., "You don't agree with him, do you?). These questions, as well as giving AC the last word, imply that the IR supports AC in his disagreement.

3.2.3.4 Disagreement between Interviewees

Clayman and Heritage (2002) and Greatbatch (1992) describe the following ways in which IEs formulate disagreement with each other. These range from least adversarial (i) to most adversarial (iii):

i) Through the mediation of the IR, when answering a question (but not before their own turn).

ii) By not waiting for their turn, but still addressing the IR.

iii) By addressing the other IE and beginning to use shorter turns, departing from the Q-A sequence to disagree. This can begin to occur in four positions:

a) After an IE's response to an IR question, an IE may disagree with a co-IE's previous remark

b) Before answering an IR's question, an IE may disagree with a co-IE's previous remark.

c) After the co-IE's turn.

d) During a co-IE's turn (interruptively).

(Greatbatch, 1992, 292)

Mitigation features of delay and agreement prefaces are not required when speaking in turn as the presence of the IR automatically mitigates disagreement. When IEs abandon the standard structure and speak directly to each other, mitigation is also not needed as by this point a conflict has already begun (Greatbatch, 1992, 299).

3.2.3.5 Disagreement in the Call-in Radio Show

As in the case of agreement, a middle ground position of disagreement can also be found in the call-in radio show. In Sai-hua Kuo's study (1994) it was found that while the IR (a psychologist) and the IE (a call-in patient) did agree on many points, disagreement was also present. The forms it took, however, much more closely resembled the hesitant, careful OC style of disagreement than the interview style of welcoming disputes. The forms used to accomplish disagreement in the call-in psychology show were delay devices (pauses and the

form "well"), the use of "but" as a contrast marker, and interruption. These can be described as follows:

i) Delay Devices - In Kuo's study, disagreement was at times expressed after a delay (i.e., pause) or a hesitation (i.e., "well"). Similar results have been obtained from the data of Schiffrin (1987) and Pomerantz (1984) in their respective studies.

ii) "But" as a contrastive marker - Another disagreement strategy found in this study was to preface a disagreement with a weak agreement, joining the two with "but". Here, the psychologist used [agreement + "but"] to convince the caller of his opinion, while the caller used [agreement + "but"] repetitively as a 'recycled turn-entry' (the reformulation of the content of the previous turn) to dispute the psychologist. 'Recycled turn entries' are competitive and signal disagreement, according to French and Local (1983).

iii) Interruption - Cooperation in turn taking does not guarantee cooperation in interaction, and vice versa. Sometimes turn entries are competitive in form but cooperative in interaction, and other times they are cooperative in form but not so in interaction. For example, here the caller was at times interactionally cooperative by agreeing with the psychologist, while at the same time being uncooperative in terms of turn taking by interrupting to voice that agreement. Consequently, Kuo broke down disagreements according to whether

they were entered in a clear space, by overlapping, or by interrupting. More than half of the psychologists' disagreements were produced interruptively, and none of the caller's was produced interruptively. The caller tended to become silent after being interrupted, yielding the floor to the psychologist. In overlaps, however, the psychologist never yielded the floor to the caller. Both the caller and the psychologist used "but" to initiate disagreement and reclaim the floor. The caller used pauses, "well", and weak agreement to withhold disagreement, while the psychologist disagreed interruptively (Sai Hua Kuo, 1994).

3.2.4 Escalating disputes

In OC, speakers are reluctant to get into disagreements. They use mitigation features to forestall utterances that could potentially lead to disharmony, and if a disagreement does ensue it rarely happens full-force and is usually brief. In the interview, however, arguments are embraced full on. They tend to happen as soon as the IR initiates them, and are rarely mitigated. This can be explained by the structure of the interview, the fact that disagreement is often preferred, and the presence of a neutral overseer (i.e., the IR) to referee any disputes that may arise (as discussed in section 3.2.3). As mitigation features are not typical in the interview, IEs must use other resources to indicate they wish to escalate a dispute – sequential positioning and turn design.

In terms of sequential positioning, the IE can either disagree when spoken to or disagree out of turn. The method they chose will give a different weight to their disagreement. Disagreeing out of turn is stronger as it is produced earlier,

breaks the question and answer format, and steals a turn. Regarding the less intense option of waiting until their turn to disagree, IEs can weight that as well by disagreeing before answering the question. This makes the disagreements stronger as they give more importance to the disagreement than the answer.

In terms of turn design, if an IE wants to intensify their disagreement they can do so by breaking the turn convention of speaking to the IR and make an unmediated comment to another IE. As well as being stronger because they are unmediated, these disagreements are also more intense as they require the IE to abandon their institutional footing (by not having the IR as the addressee).

In sum, while in OC the strength of disagreement is maintained by preference features, in the interview it is maintained by sequential positioning and turn design (Greatbatch, 1992, 279).

3.2.5 Exiting Disputes

In the interview, disputes are typically exited by the IR, and usually take the form of a topical shift. As the IR is responsible for ending the disputes, IEs rarely moderate their positions as they would in OC. So instead of coming to a close via careful negotiation, arguments in the interview usually abruptly come to a close when the IR intervenes (Greatbatch, 1992, 288-291).

3.2.6 Conclusion

In sum, agreement is not common in Anglo-Western news interviews, but when it does occur its most common form is as an acknowledgement token. This is due to issues of neutrality – IRs are not entitled to state their opinions – and issues of structure – the IE responds to questions of the IR, not to statements of

the IR. When agreement exists in forms other than the acknowledgement token, it takes similar shapes to that of OC, namely downgrading, same evaluation, and upgrading. In Sai-hua Kuo's study (1994) on the call-in radio show, however, where neutrality was not an issue, agreement was more common. There it was found to occur as acknowledgement tokens, repetition, and upgrading.

Disagreement strategies and methods used to generate disagreement in Anglo-Western interviews are footing shifts, the unequal introduction of guests and topics, choice of questioning patterns, attacks on question prefaces, and the breaking of the turn structure. In the call-in radio show, common disagreement strategies are delay devices, mitigation, overlapping, and interruptions. Disagreements between IEs are less mitigated in the news interview than in OC in Anglo-Western culture. This is because they are more preferred and thus do not need to be forestalled, and because of the turn structure of the panel interview, by which the IEs address each other via the IR. Similarly, disagreements between IEs escalate in the news interview more quickly and freely than in OC. This is because the IEs know that the IR will stop their disagreement, and they do not need to negotiate their way out of it.

In the following chapters, I will use this model of agreement and disagreement in English interviews as a starting point for the study of agreement and disagreement in Russian interviews. Based on its similarity or difference to the English model, it will be possible to suggest the likely outcome of Russian/English interviews. A key point of interest here is whether there are differences between the two models that could lead to miscommunication, and

whether this could in turn compromise achieving the goals of the interview. This point will be returned to in Chapter 4, section 2.0 (The Conclusion).

CHAPTER 2 – METHODOLOGY

1. Framework: Conversation Analysis

This study analyzes Russian agreement and disagreement strategies in the news interview using the methodology of Conversation Analysis. The following sections define and outline the history of that methodology (section 1.1), illustrate the standard procedures followed in conjunction with it (section 1.2), differentiate between the different contexts in which it can be applied (section 1.3), and

describe some of the properties of language which can be studied using Conversation Analysis (section 1.4).

1.1 History and Definition

Conversation Analysis (CA) had its beginnings in the field of sociology with Harold Garfinkel, and was later developed by Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. Some of the earliest studies were performed by Sacks; they involved analyzing transcripts from a suicide prevention center to look for *institutional features*. CA has since evolved to study how members of society produce social order by constructing solutions to organizational problems. Although this does not include only talk but also behavior and gestures, problems studied are often conversationally based (such as the opening and closing of topics, turn taking, repair, and showing agreement and disagreement). CA is similar to the ethnography of communication in the manner in which it deals with human knowledge and assumes the importance of contextual features. It takes from anthropology and ethnography the study of a rich and varied context, and from speech act theory the study of sequences in action (Schiffrin, 1994, 232).

There are two key assumptions and methodological implications to CA. Firstly, it assumes that the conduct of life is meaningful, sensible, and that people 'act' (gesture and speak) not merely 'behave' (make noise and flail limbs). Secondly, conduct is understood to be based on shared methods of social action. CA strives to explicate those methods by examining their timing (i.e., sequencing) and the roles of those acting (e.g., woman, teachers) (ibid, 233).

A distinguishing feature of CA is that it does not assume the ideologies, methodologies, and terminology of other fields, but generates it own. The logic behind this is that ideologies often become vague over time and cannot be related to actual events. CA instead works with authentic recorded conversations so that as few unfounded generalizations as possible result, and so those conversations could be returned to as a kind of proof, or backing of the results of the analysis. The data, then, are the main resource during the analysis as well as the evidence afterwards (Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997, 70). Gail Jefferson's methods for transcription are the most widely accepted, and will be used in this analysis (see Appendix 1).

An example of a transcript used in CA is as follows. This example is from the Heritage and Sefi health-visitor corpus, and was taken from Drew and Heritage, 1992 (29):

"M: And I was able to push her ou:t on my ow::n,=
HV: =Goo:d.
M: And um (0.6) I didn't have an episiotomy so:, (0.3)
HV: O:::h s[u:per.]
M: [I had] a (0.3) tiny little tea:r it wasn't a perineal one (0.2) it was a (sort of)=
HV: =Mm
M: And um (1.5) but otherwise everything was fi:ne (.) and the epidural made it lovely at the e:nd because I was able to pu:sh still hhh but I had no pai:n and it was (.) super, it was lo:vely,"

The foci of studies such as this include patterns, distributions, and forms of organization. These taped conversations are not artificially generated or prompted by the researcher, nor are assumptions made as to what the participants 'know'. This differs from a purely ethnomethodological approach, by which researchers typically would use field notes as their data and combine this with

social theories and information supplied by the participants themselves (apart from their actual conversations) (Schiffrin, 1994, 234).

1.2 Standard Procedure

Pomerantz and Fehr (quoted in, 1997, 71-4) outline five questions one should ask oneself before and while performing a study using CA. These questions can be used as a procedural guide to follow when performing the analysis.

i) Select a sequence by choosing identifiable boundaries. An initiation turn (the initiation of an action or of a topic) and subsequent turns until when interactants are no longer responding to that action or topic is a typical sequence. It should also be taken into account that sequence starts and stops have to be negotiated and ratified by both members.

ii) Characterize the speech acts in a sequence. Sometimes there are several within a sequence, and their characterizations are flexible to change.

iii) Determine how the speakers' packaging of actions (including both selection of referent and design features) gives insight into the actions and topics, and what the options of the listener are that arise as a product of the packaging. One should ask oneself what forms the speaker could have used instead (the kind of package can emphasize either deference or involvement strategies), how a different term would have given a different emphasis, and what interpretations the participants have of the action (is the action trivial, weird, stressful?).

iv) Ask how timing and turn taking provide for different interpretations of topics and acts. How did the speaker obtain the turn – did they self-select or were they offered the turn? What is the timing of the initiation – how far after the last turn did it start? Was there a gap, or a connection? And what about the termination of the turn? Did the speaker get to finish, or were they interrupted? And, lastly, how was the next speaker selected? What were the listeners doing during the last turn?

v) Ask how methods of action indicate speaker roles and relationships. Ponder the rights, obligations, and expectations of the speakers, determine if their actions are appropriate in many contexts or just in this one, and think about what implicates their roles.

In CA, although context is emphasized, it is only studied in as much as it *directly influences* the text. Thus, social relations, social variables, and setting are not necessarily taken into account - the actual conversations are instead the main focus. This is done in order to minimize generalizations and assumptions made beforehand about the results of the analysis, and also because social variables do not hold the same meaning in different contexts. However, contexts built before and after what is being studied are taken into account; this makes their function both "context-shaped" and "context-renewing" (Drew and Heritage, 1992, 18). Because context must be locally produced and developed, it is dynamic. What is relevant during one frame may not be relevant during the next. For this reason, one must not assume that features of context external to the actual conversation

(e.g., the marital status of the participants) are relevant, as they are not locally produced.

In sum, four important features of CA are as follows (Drew and Heritage, 1992, 17-19):

i) The main focus is not on linguistic features, not on context, but on social action, its organization, and alternative means that could be used to accomplish the tasks.

ii) Whereas pragmatics focuses on individual speech acts, CA deals with utterances in sequences – as that is how they occur in interaction. As they are formed based on perlocutionary features, CA links the perlocutionary and illocutionary dimensions in its sequence study.

iii) a) Utterances are context-shaped. This entails that meaning is interpreted based on the local context (on the utterance before the one being studied) and on the larger context into which the utterances fit.
b) Utterances are context-renewing. This entails that they are not only shaped by the context, but that they also shape it. This view stresses the interactional and dynamic nature of context, and reminds us of communicative breakdowns which can occur when a context is abruptly changed. This is also related to limiting the study of social variables to those variables which are directly relevant to the context.

iv) The comparison of natural and non-restricted (non-institutional) conversation with institutional interaction is vital to the understanding

of the latter. We use the former as a benchmark as it is our primary means of socialization when we are children, and thus represents our natural version of interaction.

1.3 Ordinary Conversation versus Institutional Interaction

In CA, researchers differentiate Ordinary Conversation (OC) – talk produced in everyday, unrestricted situations - from Institutional Interaction (II) – talk produced under institutional restraints of some kind. Drew and Heritage (1992, 22) describe the latter type of talk as being characterized by having at least one participant oriented to an institutional goal, institutionally imposed behavioral restraints on at least one person, and inferential frameworks specific to the institution.

The two main areas within institutions in research today are formal and non-formal settings. Formal settings have inspired the most influential studies to date, and are characterized by having the character of the institution manifest in its form (e.g., in the turn taking systems of a courtroom). Turn taking is focused on because it is the most obvious means of organization, and because it emphasizes reductions and specializations that predominate in II. Also, it is easy to spot deviations from this rigid form. The three formal settings most fitting this pattern are the classroom, the courtroom, and the news interview. Non-formal settings have less uniform patterns. Examples of these include the workplace and the doctor's office (Drew and Heritage, 1992, 25-29).

1.4 Focus of Research in Institutional Interaction

Drew and Heritage (1992, 29-53) cite five main dimensions of institutional conduct that are the foci of research:

i) Lexical Choice - This includes lay versus technical jargon ("screen" ~ "monitor"), stylistic choice ("policeman" ~ "cop"), and referential terms used ("I" ~ "we"). This latter distinction particularly shows institutional loyalties, as the substitution of "we" for "I" displays personal variables being reduced in their importance and replaced by company ideology.

ii) Turn Design - This includes both the interpretation of the activity that was accomplished in that turn (which in turn affects the course the conversation takes) and the structuring of the turn (the type of wording chosen).

iii) Sequence Organization - Different settings are characterized by different types of sequence organization. For example, the interview, the courtroom, and the classroom all employ the question-answer sequence, while other settings do not.

iv) Structural Organization - Particular interactions require a certain structural organization in order to accomplish the goals set. For example, a business meeting may require an introduction, a presentation, a discussion, and question and answer period. This can be contrasted with OC, where conversations do not typically follow programs.

v) Social Epistemology and Social Relations - II may also focus on certain themes and issues that manifest themselves through all the features discussed above. The two most common types of issues that are focused on are "professional 'cautiousness' in interaction" (Drew and Heritage, 45) and "asymmetries in institutional settings" (ibid, 47).

In sum, this study works within the framework of CA as it is a very relevant methodology to the topic at hand. In order to investigate agreement and disagreement styles as forms of social action, one must focus on the sequences and larger contexts where they occur in order to determine how these forms are initiated and what responses they may generate. Furthermore, CA's focus on authentic recorded conversations and its use of them as the main resource during the analysis ensures that agreement and disagreement will be studied as they exist in the context of real life interactions, not in artificial environments such as role plays.

2. Corpus

My corpus consists of recordings of three interview shows (*В центре внимания*, *Диалог*, and *Народ и власть*) from Radio Mayak and Mayak 24 for the months of December 2002, and March 2003. The show *В центре внимания* airs once daily from Monday to Friday at 10:00am local time, and runs for approximately 20 minutes. *Диалог* also airs once daily from Monday for Friday, at 2:10pm local time, and each segment typically runs for approximately 17

minutes. The show *Народ и власть* airs once daily on Tuesday and Thursday at 12:15 local time, and typically runs for about 20 minutes. All three shows are geared towards informing, rather than being sources of entertainment, and feature ministers, officials, party representatives, and academics as their interviewees. The major news headlines of the day constitute the topics covered, and thus include politics, international policy, and national law.

From this corpus I selected and analyzed four interviews. Three of the interviews were aired on *В центре внимания* on December 3, December 4, and March 20. One of the interviews was aired on *Диалог* on March 21. As the aim of my study is to establish a preliminary model of agreement and disagreement in Russian, I have selected the interviews for analysis based on their suitability to facilitate this aim. This suitability was derived by a preponderance of agreement and disagreement turns.

It is necessary to examine some individual details of each IR's and IE's personal backgrounds (i.e., what organizations do they represent, what views are representatives of these organizations advertised as holding), the topics of the interviews analyzed, and details of the station Radio Mayak. This information is relevant because it is the context in which the agreements and disagreements to be analyzed occur, and is thus the main resource that will be drawn upon when looking for explanations as to why the discourse unfolds in the way that it does. These details will be outlined in sections 2.1 – 2.2.

2.1 Contextually Relevant Details of Interviews

2.1.1 December 3 Interview: "Relations Between Russia, China, and India"[5]

As its title indicates, this interview is on the topic of trilateral relations between Russia, China, and India. At the time of airing Vladimir Putin was concluding a visit to Peking and was on his way to New Delhi to meet with Abdul Kalam. This interview discusses economic details and political consequences of this triad, and how it influences Russia on the international scene.

The following individuals were participants in the interview and represent the following organizations:

Tatiana Soloveva (IR)

Tatiana Soloveva has worked for Radio Mayak since at least 1999. No biographical information could be found on her, but from information posted on the Radio Mayak website it is apparent that she has conducted a fair number of interviews for the financial program *Ваши деньги*, and much fewer for *В центре внимания*. This implies that her area of expertise as an interviewer is in business, not in politics (www.radiomayak.ru, June 12, 2003).

Ivan Safranchuk (IE)

Ivan Safranchuk is the director of the Russian Delegation at CDI (Center for Defense Information). CDI develops US-Russian relations via information exchange, and is a source of independent information and security in Moscow. It

---

[5] This translation, and all those from here on, have been performed by Diana M. Rattai.

is non-partisan and non-profit, and researches global security through social, economic, environmental, political and military factors. CDI prides itself on objective analyses and thus accepts no government funding, and does not hold organizational positions on public policy for the sake of the staff's intellectual freedom. Safranchuk has worked there since 2001, when he opened that branch in Moscow (www.cdi.org/russia, March 15, 2003).

Constantine Makienko (IE)

Constantine Makienko is the deputy director at CAST (Center for Analysis and Strategy in Technology), a research institute not affiliated with any political party, commercial organization, or interest group. It is "the first and the only Russian research center specializing in analysis of Russian conventional arms trade and defense trends both nationally and internationally" (www.cast.ru/, March 15, 2003). It works with Soviet and post-Soviet research groups, but prides itself on its objectivity and independence. Values it recognizes are objectivity, independence from state bodies, liberalism, orientation to the free-market, mobility and transparency.

2.1.2 December 4 Interview: "Russia – India"

Despite its title, this interview is also on the topic of trilateral relations between Russia, China, and India. It is somewhat of a continuation of the discussion in the December 3 interview (although every IR and IE is different), and it entails questions and answers about the strategy of Russian in the East, and political and economic details of the cooperation between Russia, China, and

India. As the second IE (Bongard-Levin) is an India specialist, the conversation is more about India than China.

The following individuals were participants in the interview, expressed the following views and had the following backgrounds:

Yulii Semenov (IR)

Yulii Semenov has worked for Radio Mayak for 13 years. He graduated from Moscow State University (MGU), and in the early years of his career specialized in historical documentaries, particularly in those dealing with the victims of Stalin's repression. He later did archival work dealing with statements of politicians and heads of state during the first years of Soviet rule. He was editor of the program *Говорят и пишут ветераны*, which featured veterans of the Great Civil War. At the beginning of perestroika he became one of the initiators of political discourse on the air, and in 1990 began working for Radio Mayak (www.radiomayak.ru, February 10).

Aleksej Dmitirivich Voskresensky (IE)

Voskresensky is a professor of political science and head of that department at Moscow State University of International Relations (MGIMO). There he trains diplomats and government officials who will work for the Ministry of International Affairs and individuals who will work for international organizations such as United Nations and Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) (www.mgimo.ru, June 5, 2003).

Grigorij Maximovich Bongard-Levin (IE)

Bongard-Levin is introduced as being a famous scholar, a specialist in the history of India, and a laureate for the Government Prize of USSR and Russia. He is also a member of the Academy of Sciences in Moscow, and works in the Institute of World History (www.icp.ac.ru/RAS_1724-1999?CD_PAH/ENG/33/3381.HTM, June 12, 2003).

2.1.3 March 20 Interview: "The Suppression of the Morale of Iraqi Soldiers is the Main Aim of the First Stage of Military Operations Against Iraq"

This interview discusses the strategy and capabilities of the American and Iraqi militaries in the war in Iraq, the potential difficulties both sides may face, and how Iraq will react and retaliate. It is important to note that this interview was recorded and aired at the beginning of the military campaign, and thus the opinions given may not accurately reflect the actual outcome of the war.

The following individuals were participants in the interview, expressed the following views and had the following backgrounds:

Elena Balaeva (IR)

Elena Balaeva has worked for Mayak for at least two years. She appears to be a fairly accomplished and experienced interviewer, as she has numerous interviews posted on the Yabloko site and has interviewed Vladimir Putin himself (www.yabloko.ru, June 10, 2003; www.subscribe.ru/archive/radiomayak/200212/03191606.html, June 10, 2003).

Alexander Alexandrovich Sharavin (IE)

Sharavin is the director of The Institute of Political and Military Analysis (IPMA), a doctor of technical science, a professor, and an active member of the Academy of Military Science. IPMA deals with the study, analysis, and forecasting of issues involving geopolitics, history, military sciences, and sociology. It produces reports to various state departments such as State Security Service of the Russian Federation, State Parliament, and Ministries for Science, Industry and Technology of the Russian Federation. The institute also publishes monographs, collections, and brochures and has a library and emigrant databases that they make available to the scientific community and other interested organizations (www.ipma.ru, June 10, 2003). No information on their political orientation was found; they appear to look at issues mainly from a tactical military perspective.

2.1.4 March 21 Interview: "How Does the War in Iraq Influence the Internal Situation in the USA"

As is evident from its title, this interview is also on the topic of the war in Iraq. It opens on the topic of whether George Bush is using the war in Iraq as a means for oil or to secure his place in the 2004 American election campaign, as the title reflects, but then does not return to the topic of the "Internal Situation in the USA" until the later half of the interview. A good portion of the discussion is devoted to a discussion about world economies and the continuity of leadership after Sadam Hussein has been deposed.

The following individuals were participants in the interview, expressed the following views and had the following backgrounds:

Elena Shedrunova (IR)

Elena Shedrunova has worked for Mayak for at least two years. She appears to be a fairly accomplished interviewer as she has interviews posted on the Yabloko site (www.yabloko.ru, June 10, 2003; www.radiomayak.ru, March 10, 2003). Shedrunova is the only interviewer for the program *Диалог*.

Alexsei Demosfenovich Bogaturov (IE)

Alexsei Demosfenovich Bogaturov is the director of Academic Educational Forum on International Relations (AEFIR), a non-profit organization mandated to promote education and research in the fields of international relations, security, and political science. It aims to "ensure conformity of the Russian education in political science to the most advanced foreign standards" and employs "a combination of the deep Western methodology and vast teaching and research experience in the field of political science" (www.obraforum.ru, June 12, 2003).

2.2 Radio Mayak

Radio Mayak and Mayak 24 are two radio channels broadcast by the parent company Mayak, a member of VGTRK (All-Russian State Television and Radio Company; see Chapter 2, section 2.2.1). Both channels are national. Radio Mayak started broadcasting on August 1, 1964, when it was the first 24-hour news-and-music state radio. It has programming in the areas of news, music, talk, sports, and information, as well as "the analysis of the political, social, economical, and cultural life of Russia and the world" (www.radiomayak.ru, 2003). Mayak cites their audience as being adults over 35, covering a range of

society members including the educated, employed, retired, blue-collar workers, and homemakers.

Mayak 24 was created in the year 2000. It advertises itself as being "Russia's only live, national radio station providing news, twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, where you can hear breaking news, sport, culture, finance, weather, traffic reports and live coverage of Moscow's life and local governments decisions." (www.radiomayak.ru, 2003). The difference between the two channels Mayak and Mayak 24 are that while the former broadcasts both music and news information and is cited as having a target audience of adults over 35, Mayak 24 does not include music in its programming and is said not to be "disproportionately representative of any single . . . age group" (ibid).

3. Methodology

In accordance with the framework of CA, the methodology used in this study involved the following steps:

i) "Micro" Analysis - Each utterance was examined to see what speech act it was accomplishing (weak/strong agreement/disagreement, use of preference features). Features looked at to determine this included qualifiers, mitigation devices, question prefaces, and modifiers. For example, take the following extract:

(2) [December 3][6]

[6] Transcripts of interviews are identified in the examples and classified in Appendix 3 by the date on which they were broadcast.

214 **МАКИЕНКО:** [Кстати], я хочу бы добавить что в Южной Корее но это о Японии Иван

215 сказал, (.) hhh аа:: это нерешенная территориальная проблема, hh а что касается

216 Южной Кореи то я:: хочу сказать что hh аа:: в Южной Корее особенно военные

217 очень хорошо помнят (.) hh о том аа:: чьим оружием воевали северокорейские

218 коммунисты и по большому счету чьим оружием аа:: оснащена северокорейская армия.

219 **САФРАНЧУК:** И угрожает.

220 **МАКИЕНКО:** И угрожает.

To analyze this segment it is first necessary to define the speech acts performed in order to see what the utterances are accomplishing. Prior to this segment, Makienko and Safranchuk, in response to a question by the interviewer, were discussing why Russia has been pursuing the development of trilateral relations with India and China instead of with other countries in the region such as Korea or Japan. Makienko and Safranchuk had been both cooperatively suggesting strategic reasons for the trilateral development before line 214. We can see that the turn initiated in line 214 is cooperatively adding to what preceded it by "я хочу бы добавить..." and it leads to agreement through upgrading (line 219). This is followed by an agreement through same-evaluation (line 220). The feature used to

express this is ["и" + verb]; the verb "угрожать" functioning as an upgrade in line 219 and as an expression of same-evaluation in line 220.

ii) "Macro" Analysis: The turn structure was then studied to determine where it deviates from the standard question-answer sequence found in the interview. The time intervals between the turns were examined as well, but they appeared not to be relevant. Through this it was possible to ascertain whether any features noted in step one were responsible for structural irregularities. The extent to which the participants were still oriented to the interview or to their own personal face needs was also noted.

In the case of excerpt (2), by looking at the turn structure as it relates to the features used we can gain a clearer indication of the weight of the agreements. Both Makienko and Safranchuk have departed from the standard question-answer turn structure to agree with each other. This gives weight to their agreement, as the impulse to agree is stronger than their adherence to their standard interviewee roles (as providers of answers to questions). It also raises the question of whether at this point in the interview the two interviewees are more orientated to cooperation and solidarity than to answering the questions of the interviewer.

iii) Confirmation: The initial classifications of speech acts as constituting agreement and disagreement were confirmed with a native Russian speaker. This was necessary as non-native speakers can miss subtle nuances of their second language, which could possibly result in the misreading of an utterance. In the cases where there was a discrepancy between the native Russian speaker and my own reading of an utterance, I consulted a second native speaker.

These three steps were performed for each interview separately. The instances of agreement and disagreement were then classified according to their structure and their meanings in their immediate contexts. Based on this, I established the basis of a model of types of agreement and disagreement in Russian, and the relative strengths and weaknesses of the forms.

In the discussion (Chapter 4) the functions of these forms are illustrated to show how Russian agreements and disagreements work with each other to produce unique episodes within interviews.

CHAPTER 3 – ANALYSIS

1. Outline

This chapter presents the results of the analysis of Russian agreement and disagreement in news interview shows. The forms of agreement and disagreement are classified into two main groups – strong and weak. Strong forms are characterized by being unmediated (comments are addressed to the party for whom they are intended, as opposed to being addressed to a third party), explicit, not containing "other" components (in the case of disagreements, "other" components are agreement components; the reverse is true for agreements), direct (not hedged, prefaced, or stalled), fluent, unqualified, or using strong vocabulary (extreme modifiers). Weak forms are characterized by being mediated, implicit, containing "other" components, prefaced, hedged, stalled, hesitated, qualified, or using moderate vocabulary. A form need not have all the above characterizations to be strong or weak and may have some characteristics of each type. When the latter occurs, the form is classified according to its content and design (being explicit, containing "other" components, being qualified) as opposed to its delivery or prosodic features (being hesitated or stalled). For

example, one type of weak disagreement is Qualified Disagreement. Although this form is often direct and explicit, it is weak due to the presence of qualifiers.

A final designation of a form being strong versus weak would require a large number of forms to analyze. However, this corpus is relatively small due to its being a preliminary study, and as it is the first of its kind involving Russian language data there are no other such studies to draw from for examples. The designations strong and weak as used here are thus only starting points from which potential further studies could launch a more in depth analysis with a larger number of forms.

Within the designations strong and weak, there are several types of agreement and disagreement. These will be discussed in their respective sections with details outlining what the form consists of, who typically uses it (the IR or the IE), and what its function appears to be in the Russian interview (e.g., a dispute escalator or a sign of solidarity). Examples of each type of agreement and disagreement will also be given. Following the description of each specific type of agreement and disagreement is a section outlining different types of interaction patterns found.

The overall results of the analysis are presented in the Table 1. The agreements and disagreements are classified according to their type to facilitate the descriptions given in sections 2 and 3, and according to the interviews in which they occur in order to facilitate the format of the Discussion (Chapter 4).

Table 1: Overall Results of Analysis of Russian Agreement and Disagreement

AGREEMENT	Dec. 3	Dec. 4	Mar. 20	Mar. 21	Total
Strong Agreement					
Direct Agreement (DA)	1	4	3	2	10
Upgrading (U)	3	2	4	2	11
Same Evaluation (SE)	1		3	6	10
Weak Agreement					
Agreement via IR (AIR)	1				1
Affiliation (AF)		5	5	2	12
[Disagreement + Agreement] (DGAG)		1		1	2
Token Agreement (TA)			3	1	4
Downgrade (DG)				2	2
Total	**6**	**12**	**18**	**16**	**52**

DISAGREEMENT	Dec. 3	Dec. 4	Mar. 20	Mar. 21	Total
Strong Disagreement					
By Question (DBQ)				7	7
Strong Contradiction (SCD)				3	3
Strong (SD)				6	6
Weak Disagreement					
Weak Contradiction (WCD)	3		1	3	7
[Agreement + Disagreement] (AGDG)	5		2	5	12
Qualified (QD)				2	2
With Repair (DWR)		1		3	4
Total	**8**	**1**	**3**	**29**	**41**

2. Agreements

2.1 Weak Agreements

Based on this analysis of Russian agreement and disagreement in the news interview, five types of weak agreement were found: Agreement Via the IR, Affiliation, Agreement with Disagreement Preface, Token Agreement, and Downgrading.

2.1.1 Agreement Via the IR

Agreement Via the IR (AIR) is an IE form, and involves one IE agreeing with the other by addressing their comments to the IR. It could occur both in turn and out of turn. While the latter variety is stronger, as it would require breaking the established turn structure, both types are weak agreement because the forms are not addressed to the agreed-with pary.

As this corpus contains only one instance of AIR, it is not possible to draw any conclusions as to the variety of forms the agreements within AIR could take in Russian (upgrading, downgrading, etc.). This example of AIR is presented in excerpt (1). Prior to line 196 the IR had asked the other IE (Constantine Makienko) why he thought Russia was pursuing bilateral relations with China and India to a greater degree than with other Asian countries, such as Japan and South Korea. In line 196 she then asks Safranchuk his opinion on the same issue, which he gives in accompaniment with AIR (lines 198-9).

(1) [December 3]

196 *IR: Hh Но если говорить не только об оборонной сфере, я так скажу а вообще о*

197 *политике по большому счету*[7].
198 САФРАНЧУК (IE): **А: если говорить о политике по большому счету то то что: сказал**
199 **Константин начало это тоже правда.**[8](0.5) Ааа:: <Китай и Индия гораздо <более
200 самостоятельны> в своей глобальной политике чем аа: Япония и-и Южная
201 Корея>.hhh К тому же нельзя забывать об определенной традиции.hhh Влия:ние аа:
202 России в Южной Корее: и в Японии практически нулевое.hhh Аа: с Японией вообще
203 до сих пор не разрешен территориальный спор. и там говорить о каких-то больших
204 право-прорывах в двусторонних отношениях вообще нельзя.hh К тому же, (.) и
205 отношения с Китай-а и отношения с Кореей и отношения с Японией осложнены аа:
206 например такой проблемой как hhh на: контрабанда российских биоресурсов в эти
207 две страны. Да в Китай тоже (.) идет контрабанда российских биоресурсов с
208 Дальнего Востока но все-таки не в таких объемах как в Корею hhh и и в Японию.hhh
209 Очевидно что (.) и здесь я возвращаюсь к тому что уже говорил, hhh очевидно что (.)
210 для того чтобы получить новых союзников в глобальной политике, hhh России
211 нужны такие восточные (.) аа п-партнеры, (.) как Индия аа: и Китай. Ни Япония ни
212 Корея не могут выполнить hhh аа: этой:: этой роли.

2.1.2 Affiliation

Affiliation (AF) is a weak form of agreement that involves the speaker aligning with the sentiment of a previous remark. Two types of AF were found in this corpus – interviewee AF (nine out of twelve cases) and interviewer AF (three out of twelve cases). The first type occurs in response to IR questions preceded

[7] Italicized text with excerpts from the transcripts indicates IR talk.

[8] Bolded text within excerpts from the transcripts indicates the particular form being referred to in the analysis.

by lengthy prefaces. In these examples the IR was not oriented to neutrality and showed their perspective in the question prefaces, which served as preference features. The IE, in performing AF, would implicitly agree with this question preface (which was an expression of the IR's perspective) by reformulating its sentiment in their answer, or as a preface or coda to their answer. In this way the line between agreement and complying with preference features was somewhat blurry in the data – because the IR showed so much of their perspective when exerting preference features, compliance with preference amounted to agreement.

An example of this type of AF can be seen in excerpt (2). The IR states his preference for how he would like the IE (Voskresensky) to answer his question in the bolded text from lines 104-107 in a way that amounts to him giving his opinion on the subject. The IE responds by reformulating that sentiment in the beginning of his answer. This is an example of where the line between agreement and complying with preference is obscured, as the IE in this case is doing both.

(2) [December 4]

103 *IR:* hh *Ну вы знаете я хотел бы вас попросить* hh *несколько слов сказать о:: mm::*

104 *перспективе создания транспортных коридоров.* hh ***Это новое аа: так сказать***

105 ***направление международного сотрудничества сравнительно новое.*** hh ***И здесь***

106 ***пространство России и ее географическое и геополитическое положение между***

107 hh ***Востоком и Западом*** hh ***открывает большие перспективы.***

108 ВОСКРЕСЕНСКИЙ (IE):Ну это:: аа: <очень перспективная крайне важная но непростая

109 задача>. hh **Крайне перспективная и важная это понятно, потому что скажем,**

110 **уникальное географическое положение России фактически делает ее hh транс-и-**

111 **оо::-физическим трансконтинентальным мостом между Европой hh и Азией...**

The IR performed the second type of AF found in this corpus, which consists of filling-in words and finishing the sentences of the IE. This serves the function of both showing acknowledgement and support of the IE's points as well as furthering their own agenda. Filling in words and finishing sentences also performs the function of showing affiliation and solidarity in English and some Asian languages (Scollon & Scollon, 2001; Collier, 2001). The second function of furthering IR agenda, however, is a little less obvious until one looks at the IR's views as expressed in the interview as a whole. In the two interviews where interviewer AF exists (March 20 and March 21), the vast majority of IR assertions involve making derogatory comments about the United States or emphasizing potential vulnerabilities or difficulties that country may encounter in pursuing military involvement in Iraq (see sections 2.1.3 and 2.1.4). The three cases of AF here all emphasize this point, drawing attention to this side of the war in Iraq. This can be seen in excerpt (3).

(3) [March 20]

141 *IR: = Аа: скажите насколько вот по вашему мнению как опытного военного:: аа::*

142 *mm: насколько влиять самые (1.0) плохие независимые погодные условия сейчас*

143 *(.) хотя бы на продвижение с пехота::: hh морской hhhh Соединенны Штаты?*

144 ШАРАВИН (IE): Аа:: безусловно, (1.0) погодные условия влияют. И hh аа: иракцам,

145 проживающим в этой местности, гораздо легче переносить hh аа: вот эти аа::

146 пыльные бури. hh Это на самом деле действительно: аа:: большое такое

147 психологическое испытание и[:::]

148 IR: *[деморализует] их просто=*

149 ШАРАВИН (IE): =Да, это физическая большая нагрузка на военных.

2.1.3 Agreement with Disagreement Preface

Agreement with Disagreement Preface (DGAD) is a weak form, following the design of a [disagreement + "но" + agreement]. It occurs here as a response to very non-neutral, lengthy, prefaced questions, which have personal footing, strong preference for agreement, and negative interrogatives. As can be seen in excerpt (4), the agreement portion is emphasized and exaggerated. It is punctuated with micro pauses for extra emphasis (lines 148-9), and even contains upgrades (although the IR only discusses his point in terms of economics, the IE upgrades this to say that it is also valid from the point of view of psychology; lines 149-51). This almost makes the form strong; it would be interesting to examine other instances of DGAG in Russian to determine if they also are stronger-weak forms or if they, like their English counterparts, are very weak.

(4) [December 4]

129 *IR: ...*hh *Теперь mm:: вы знаете мы говорим о:: (.)*

130 *материальном сотрудничестве (.)*hh *с Китаем и Индией = Но есть, на мой*

131 *взгляд, <еще один момент>.* hhh *Аа:: но: Я (0.5) постарше вас, я помню времена,*

132 *когда* hhh *Россия н::о то есть Советский Союз тогда еще был (.) в положении*

133 *своего рода старшего брата. который оказывал экономическую помощь Китаю и*

134 *Индии.* hhh *Сейчас Китай экономически от нас ушел далеко вперед это все*

135 *признают,* hhh *но::, аа:: на мой взгляд, и Индия нас обходит-аа: на повороте по:* hh

136 *в развитии особенно* hh *электроники, новых технологий, и по (.) динамике*

137 *экономического роста, хотя* hh *мы свои (0.5) плюс четыре процента в год тоже*

138 *имеем.* hhh *Аа: нет ли смысла:: более пристально присмотреться именно к*

139 *методам (.) экономических реформ?* hh *У нас часто говорят тот о:: жесткой*
140 *вертикали власти в Китае,* hh *еще о чем-то.* hh *Я говорю именно об*
141 *экономической стороне дела.*
142 ВОСКРЕСЕНСКИЙ (IE): hh Ну вы знаете:, я прежде всего не склонен: аа: бить в грудь и
143 говорить что в России все очень плохо::, я думаю что мы: достаточно многое
144 сделали и hh страны нужно сравнивать аа: их можно сравнивать по общим
145 показателям = А скажем:, понятно что Китай просто колоссальная страна с
146 колоссальным населением, hh со:: в этом плане она просто на первом месте в мире
147 стоит. hh Но есть другие показатели, скажем, доход на душу населения = Здесь
148 скажем в отношении России все не так плохо. hh Но вы (.) заметили (.) совершенно
149 (.) верно, hh аа:: <сегодня очень важна>, и не только с точки зрения экономики, но и
150 с точки зрения психологии, и вообще, аа:-жизни обычного человека, динамика
151 экономического развития. hh И здесь надо сказать, и Китай (.) Китай в большей
152 степени, Индия в меньшей степени, но также (.) достигла очень впечатляющих
153 результатов. hh Вот это очень важное. hh К чему нужно присмотреться? Я думаю
154 что главная (.) вещь, которую мы< hh мы не можем заимствовать конкретные аа::
155 экономические вещи просто, потому что Россия находится на другом этапе своего
156 развития< hh и аа: политического, и экономического. hh Но к чему мы должны
157 внимательно присмотреться, это к (.) mm:: <стратегии> (.) экономического развития.
158 Скажем, в <<Китае< и в Индии такая стратегия разработана, и она проводится в
159 день-вот аа:: в:: жизнь день за днем, год за годом.>> hh А вот с этим у нас
160 проблемы.

2.1.4 Token Agreement

Token Agreement (TA), as in English, consists here of brief, often non-lexical interjections that provide some kind of implicit support to the interlocutor. These tokens are acknowledgement tokens, as opposed to continuation tokens (see section 3.2.2.1). Although TA is by nature spoken as an interruption and is

direct and fluent, due to its implicit and non-semantic nature it is a weak form. Of the four examples in this corpus three are uttered by the IR in the March 20 interview, and are in response to answers to questions not involving preference. Excerpt (5) is an instance of this. During and after the TA the IE (Sharavin) continues talking as though nothing happened.

(5) [March 20]

44 ШАРАВИН (IE): hh Аа: вы знаете, на самом деле, аа: hh аа: за (1.5) последние может
45 быть аа: полгода было опубликовано огромное количество в прессе вот возможных
46 вариантов аа: действий вооруженных сил США и их союзников. hh И: аа: такими
47 подробностями эти планы сопровождались, hh что можно было подумать, ага! вот
48 мы узнали [реаль]ной
49 *IR: [mm hm]*
50 ШАРАВИН (IE): план.

The IE performed the other example of TA in the corpus (occurring in the March 21 interview). It was not a non-semantic "mhm" but "да", and was in response to a Contradiction.

2.1.5 Downgrading

Downgrading (DG) exists in this corpus as it does in English – as weak agreement by lessening the intensity of the assessment which is being agreed with. It is an IE form, used in response only to sarcastic Disagreement by Questions. This rather complex form is treated in detail in section 3.3.3.

Disagreement by Question (DQ) is an exaggerated summary of the IE's point of view which somewhat ridicules him while strongly preferring agreement. This fact makes DQ difficult to respond to. The IE cannot disagree as the

statement does contain some truth, but they also cannot strongly agree without ridiculing themselves. The best option, and the one taken by the IEs in this corpus, is to reformulate the IR's statement by lessening its intensity, or Downgrade, as can be seen in excerpt (6).

(6) [March 21]

71 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): [Сейчас] Да Европа живет своей жизнью. М::ы по Европе
72 судим по тому, как она представляется в наших средствах массовой информации, на
73 которые можно, как известно, влиять. hh И поэтому:: не надо делать резких
74 движений. Не то что была сила отлично. hh Ну: пока что вот так говорить, что евро
75 сильнее, чем доллар, [ну нет такого пока в мире.]
76 *IR: [А каково состояние американской экономики?]*
77 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): Американская экономика, она::: [оо:: испытывается]
78 *IR: [лучше всех в мире, да?]=*
79 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): **=Я-я-не скажу что она лучше чем все в мире, но, в общем, до сих**
80 **пор это локомотиво мировой экономики.**

Note that this example of DG is prefaced by [disagreement + "но"]. In this sense it is also a DGAG. It is included in this section, however, as the form that the agreement takes is that of a downgrade.

2.2 Strong Agreements

The following types of strong agreements were found in the corpus: Direct Agreement, Upgrading, and Same Evaluation.

2.2.1 Direct Agreement

Direct Agreement (DA) is unconditional, straightforward, strong agreement with no hesitation, delay, or disagreement components, and is often voiced with relatively strong vocabulary items such as "безусловно" and "совершенно верно". It is an IE form seven out of ten times in this corpus, and

its functions can be categorized into two main groups: (a) closing an episode of some kind (dispute, agreement sequence) or changing topic, and (b) accepting affiliation attempts or upgrades.

An example of function (a) can be seen in excerpt (7). The DA is direct and fluent, and is that much stronger due to its being spoken interruptively. It is used after a minor disagreement sequence consisting of a Disagreement with Agreement Preface challenge, a Dispute defense, a Disagreement with Agreement Preface back down (lines 167-72), and then this DA close (lines 173-4).

(7) [December 3]

167 САФРАНЧУК (IE): [hhh]A-A-A- как раз имею виду что:: оо:: с моей точки
168 зрения в случае с Индией (.) аа:: может быть даже больше чем в случа:е с Китаем
169 (.) именно потому, что в Индию дет-идет более высокотехнологичное оборудование
170 hhh наши отношения выходят (.) за парадигму (.) торговец (.) покупатель и
171 становятся чем-то большим.hhh С одной стороны это хорошо< (.) а с другой
172 стороны это:: и:::и не очень хорошо.
173 МАКИЕНКО (IE): [Да] конечно это
174 обязательство.

An example of DA's function (b) is presented in excerpt (8). In this example the IE (Sharavin) is answering a question in compliance with the preference features, and when the IR upgrades he shows his acceptance with "да" (line 68).

(8) [March 20]

65 ШАРАВИН (IE): ...hh У американцев нет

66 возможности, допустим, совершать удары с территории Ирана. [hh Aa: не возможно]
67 *IR: [И с территории Турции.]*
68 ШАРАВИН (IE): **Да.** Турции тоже в определенной мере все равно hh задействована,
69 территория Турции Турции но не в такой мере, как Кувейта, допустим, конечно
70 основной план-плацдарм это Кувейт...

2.2.2 Upgrading

Upgrading (U), as in English agreement, involves increasing the intensity of the previous statement or expanding on it in a way that is consistent with its sentiment. Both the IR and IE use Upgrading in this corpus; in the case of the IR it is used to further their agenda or to steer the conversation, and is thus more of a strategic move. In the case of the IE it is used when they want to add something to the conversation, and shows affiliation with the point of view of the interlocutor.

Upgrading is a strong form because of its directness as well as because it not only agrees but also takes the agreement one step further. The upgrades in this corpus are usually accepted with some form of agreement; this establishes common ground during the first agreement, and then expands the basis for agreement further so that more is established to be held in common. This is a result even when IRs use Upgrading to promote their own agenda. Although the motive of an U in this case is somewhat selfish, its result is the same. Because of this feature of upgrades, they are used at the beginning of and during agreement sequences but not as final moves or de-escalators.

This result of Upgrading can be seen in excerpt (9). Here the IR steps out of her role as questioner to agree (line 134), and this leads to an interviewee

upgrade (line 135) followed by another interviewer upgrade (line 138) and then Same Evaluation (line 139).

(9) [March 20]

129 ШАРАВИН (IE): ...Для них аа: война в определенной степени этот (0.5)
130 полигон hh и аа::
131 *IR: для испытания*
132 ШАРАВИН (IE): для полигона испытаний оружия, и: они сделают максимально возможное для того,
133 чтобы hh аа::: получить эти данные для себя.
134 *IR:* ***И:: подавить тем самым еще и моральный дух аа::=***
135 ШАРАВИН (IE): **=Да и моральны: и очень физически уничтожить противника.** Я думаю
136 что оо: mm: на:: какое-то (0.5) прямые контакты между: сухопутными соединениями
137 hh аа: США и Ирака американцы не пойдут.
138 *IR:* ***M hm. И делают все возможное, чтобы=***
139 ШАРАВИН (IE): =Они сделают аа: все возможное, чтобы свести их по крайне мере возможность к
140 минимуму...

An example of IR Upgrading can also be seen in excerpt (8). In this interview (March 20) the vast majority of IR assertions involve making derogatory comments about the United States or emphasizing potential vulnerabilities or difficulties they may encounter in pursuing military involvement in Iraq (see section 2.1.3). This upgrade, then, furthers her agenda as well as steers the conversation to elaborate on points that she would like to be emphasized. These interviewer upgrades are also somewhat like prompts, as they consist of a small number of words that steer the conversation into a different direction. All interviewer upgrades are accepted, which means that in this corpus Upgrading is a very successful manipulative device.

2.2.3 Same Evaluation

Same Evaluation (SE) involves agreeing by repeating the evaluation of the prior assessment. It exists both as exact repetitions and reformulations. It is strong as it is direct, explicit, fluent, and not hedged or containing disagreement components.

Both IR and IE use Same Evaluation. When the IE uses it it can end conversation on a topic by simply repeating a sentiment and not expanding on it any further. This effort to close a topic is not always accepted by the IR, however, as they may chose to keep asking questions. An example of this can be seen in excerpt (10). This excerpt follows the end of a long session of disagreeing. SE is used in response to a tag question offered by the IR which "gives in" to the IE's (Bogaturov's) side of the dispute. The IR then repeats this evaluation again. This initiates the close to their dispute.

(10) [March 21]

110 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): [Если он наступает] по чуть-чуть, это
111 совершенно [тоже]
112 IR: *[это нормальный кризис, да?]*
113 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): **[да] это нормальный кри[зис,]**
114 *IR: [это*
нормальный
115 ***кризис]***

116 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): [потому что это тот кризис] который ведет к разрешению проблемы. А мы говорим о
117 кризисе, как об обвале. Об обломе.

Interviewer SE is used a little differently than Interviewee SE in this corpus. It is used either as a strategic move, which either emphasizes a point the

IR wishes to draw attention to, or (in one case) sarcastically, in a way which mocks the IE's last utterance. This last form is more like disagreement than agreement, but as there is only one example of it in the corpus it will not be discussed further.

Excerpt (11) is an example of interviewer SE. The IE (Sharavin) is answering a question in a way that complies with the IR's preference (to emphasize how the extreme weather conditions in Iraq will be difficult for the Americans to bear). The IR repeats "это тоже самое" (line 154) because she wishes to draw attention to the vulnerabilities of the US military in Iraq.

(11) [March 20]

149 ШАРАВИН (IE): ...Аа:: и:: конечно иракская
150 страна тоже испытывает эти нагрузки, но hh давайте вспомним (.) аа:: (1.0) аа: зиму
151 hh сорок первого года под Москвой<. О::дно дело сибирякам было переносить те
152 морозы, хотя они так же мерзли, так же им было холодно другое дело немцам было.
153 hh Вот аа[:: это примерно то[же самое]
154 *IR: [это то же самое]*
155 ШАРАВИН (IE): Да, это примерно то же самое.

3. Disagreements

3.1 Weak Disagreements

The following types of weak disagreements were found in the corpus: Qualified Disagreement, Disagreement with Repair, Contradiction, and Disagreement with Agreement Preface.

3.1.1 Qualified Disagreement

Qualified Disagreement (QD) is disagreement weakened by qualifiers that emphasize the authorship of the remark is to be attributed to the speaker alone, and is not objective fact. Examples of such qualifiers are "мне кажется" and "по моему". It is the use of these qualifiers alone that make the form of this disagreement weak; in its deliverance it is not necessarily hesitated or delayed.

QD is used twice in this data, and in both cases by the IE (Bogaturov) in the March 21 interview. Both of these instances of QD are in response to stronger forms used by the IR, and appear to have the function of "toning down" the beginning of a dispute. Take, for example, the following excerpt. The IR and the IE (Bogaturov) had just been discussing the previous American presidents in terms of their strengths and shortfalls, including which presidents have been successful in improving the economic situation in the United States. This brings their discussion to the economic state of that country, and with this a divergence in the views of the IR and the IE. Bogaturov maintains that the United States is not in a state of economic crisis, while the IR uses Strong Disagreement to interject the opposite point of view (line 62). This Strong Disagreement is quite competitive and confrontational and would seem to have the potential to escalate things into a dispute. However, the IE does not accept this confrontation and offers QD as a means of "toning down" a potential escalation (lines 63 and 64). The qualifiers used, as stated above, emphasize that the authorship of the remark is to be attributed to the speaker alone, and is not objective fact. This weakens the IE's side of the argument.

(12) [March 21]

57 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): Правильно. Но экономика сейчас будет играть скорее на президента
58 Буша, потому что, (0.5) аа:: хотя и Клинтон был чрезвычайно успешным в
59 экономическом смысле президентом, но пока что никакого hh аа:: экономического
60 спада за рушение признаков серьезного кризиса, несмотря на то, что все его
61 кризиса ждут в Америке пока его нет.
62 *IR: Как? Он есть и продолжается вот уже несколько лет подряд.*
63 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): Ну, вот это, это такой кризис, который, как **мне кажется**, в Москве
64 ощущается сильнее, чем в Америке. То есть не надо преувеличивать ну **по моему**
65 признаки кризиса в Америке.

3.1.2 Disagreement With Repair

Disagreement with Repair (DWR) is disagreement accompanied by an apology or request for permission to voice that disagreement. This weakens the strength of the utterance, as it acknowledges that it may not be preferred, expected, or justified. This disagreement is not necessarily hesitated or paused, but is made weak by the presence of repair. Examples of types of repair that could be used are "извините" and "простите".

The following example (13) contains three of the four examples of DWR present in the corpus, here used twice by the IR and once by the IE. This excerpt follows immediately after example (12), and thus occurs in the same context.

(13) [March 21]

63 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): Ну, вот это, это такой кризис, который, как мне кажется, в Москве
64 ощущается сильнее, чем в Америке. То есть не надо преувеличивать ну по моему
65 признаки кризиса в Америке.
66 (1.5)

67 *IR: **hh Нет, но простите::**, (1.0) почем есть в Америке, почем есть в Москве:: если:::*

68 *удреп-укрепляется евро, (0.5)*

69 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): Н[у:]

70 *IR: [и] это показатель. (То есть в Европе значит смотреть*

71 *так и думать да плохо счет экономика с Соединенными Штатами.)*

72 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): **С вашего позволения, так, но не совсем.** Потому что то что

73 укрепляется евро, это то, хочется думать европейцам, а то что аа: хочется (0.5)

74 писать, и чтобы hh везде передавалось в Рос[сии. ((laughing))]

75 *IR: [hhh ((laughing))] Вот не надо. Вот*

76 *люди, которые работают на рынках, (если) воз[мож]ность, они не-не-не то что*

77 *мы считаем что должно быть так поэтому мы*

78 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): да

79 *IR: будем покупать hhh евро дороже чем доллар. **Извините**, (и еще) другими*

80 *мотивами руководствуются=*

81 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): =Игра на повышение евро, это совершенно значимая, официальная

82 вещь...

3.1.3 Weak Contradiction

Weak Contradiction (WCD) is a form that expresses disagreement by simply contradicting the sentiment of or disputing the prior utterance. It does not contain any explicit reference to the fact that it is a disagreement (such as repair or [agreement preface + "but"]), and is not necessarily hesitated or paused. What can make it weak is instead its polite wording.

WCD is used by the IE, is usually dispreferred, and follows either an agreement or a prefaced question. The following excerpt is an example of how these features are manifested in the WCD of this corpus. Preceding the lines here, the IEs (Makienko and Safranchuk) were having a cooperative discussion about why Russia was pursuing bilateral relations with China and India and not with Korea or Japan. The IEs agreed with each other, and the question and answer

format was broken for them to make same evaluations and upgrades on the others' points. When the IR attempted to join in on this exchange through an upgrade, however (lines 223-224) she is contradicted (lines 225-232). Although the IEs couch their disagreement in merely expressing their opinion, what they are saying goes against the sentiment of the IR - thus forming disagreement.

(14) [December 3]

223 *IR: hhh Ну вот это: такой может быть тоже (.) аспект (вот) >наверное не*
224 *политический а чисто психологический и моральный асте[кт]?<*
225 МАКИЕНКО (IE): **[аа:] Вы знаете, аа: Корея понесла**
226 **такие чудовищные потери, что ее трудно упрекнуть в том что этот моральный**
227 **аспект аа: сильно присутствует [у нее].**
228 САФРАНЧУК (IE): **[Аа:: вы знаете] не забывайте что это мы могли в годы холодной**
229 **войны считать что Вашингтон он где-то там <далеко>.hh А от Сеула до Пхеньяна**
230 **несколько десятков километров = Поэтому для <u>них</u> (.) эти моральные (.)**
231 **переживания не очень живы и подкрепляются колючей проволокой на 38-й**
232 **параллели.**

3.1.4 Disagreement with Agreement Preface

Disagreement with Agreement Preface (AGDG) is disagreement preceded by [agreement components + "but"]. The length and intensity of both portions of this type of utterance can vary depending on the strength with which one wishes to disagree. When disagreement is not preferred, such as after affiliation attempts, the agreement component is longer and the disagreement is somewhat hesitated or stalled. When disagreement is more expected, however, such as after Contradiction, or Strong Disagreement, the agreement portion is minimal (even one word) and the disagreement is not hesitated but direct and fluent.

Even in its strongest form, however, AGDG is still weak and only the IE used it in this corpus. This is probably due to structural reasons, as the longer turns of interviews belong to the IE, and AGDG is a rather expansive type of response.

The following excerpt is an example of a relatively weak form of AGDG. Note the longer than average pause of 1.5 seconds preceding the turn as well as the extra micro-pause and hesitation preceding the disagreement portion (line 55).

(15) [December 3]

52 *IR: hhh Ну когда вы говорите: об укреплении: аа: нашего Дальневосточного региона*
53 *тут сотрудничество как раз с Китаем вполне может быть уместным.*
54 (1.5)
55 САФРАНЧУК (IE): **hhh <Аа: отчасти да, (.) аа: отчасти (.) аа: нет**, потому что,> на
56 Дальнем Востоке наоборот многие считают что:, чрезмерно активное
57 проникновение китайского капитала на Дальний Восток (.) hh аа: ослабляет. (.) аа:
58 позиции Москвы на (.) Дальнем Востоке ослабляет этот регион. hhh Аа: здесь могут
59 быть крайне неоднозначные оценки.

Excerpt (16) provides an example of a less weak variety of AGDG. Here, preceded by an aggressive, competitive upgrade, the disagreement portion is not forestalled and is much more expansive than the agreement. Perhaps this is because politeness is less preferred here than it is with the other forms of AGDG (due to its following the competitive upgrade), and because the agreement is inserted only because the truth of the IR's statement cannot be disputed.

(16) [March 21]

118 *IR: Но: у Клинтона:: еще за Клинтона было один момент. И весьма существенный*
119 *которого не упоменули. Я имею в виду экономическую ситуацию в стране.*
120 *Экономика была в очень плохом состоянии, когда Буш старший сдавал дела.*
121 (1.5)

122 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): **Правильно. Но экономика сейчас будет играть скорее на президента**
123 **Буша**, потому что, (0.5) аа:: хотя и Клинтон был чрезвычайно успешным в
124 экономическом смысле президентом, но пока что никакого hh аа:: экономического
125 спада за рушение признаков серьезного кризиса, несмотря на то, что все его
126 кризиса ждут в Америке пока его нет.

3.2 Strong Disagreements

The following types of strong disagreements were found in the corpus - Direct Disagreement (DD), Disagreement by Question (DQ) and Strong Contradiction (SCD).

3.2.5 Direct Disagreement

Direct Disagreement (DD) is straightforward, uninhibited disagreement with absolutely no agreement components or pretence for affiliation. Often it is spoken at a pace noticeably quicker than the surrounding utterances, and there is a minimal gap between it and its previous utterance.

In this corpus DD is used five out of six times by the IR. It can occur without provoking the IE into an escalated dispute, and is followed by weaker forms in all but one case (leading to the only case of interviewee DD). This corpus is not large enough to draw conclusions about the nature of DD in Russian, but based on this study it does appear to be a slightly less strong form than it would be in English because of the weaker forms its invokes.

The following excerpt (17) is an example of DD.

(17) [March 21]

57 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): Правильно. Но экономика сейчас будет играть скорее на президента
58 Буша, потому что, (0.5) аа:: хотя и Клинтон был чрезвычайно успешным в
59 экономическом смысле президентом, но пока что никакого hh аа:: экономического
60 спада за рушение признаков серьезного кризиса, несмотря на то, что все его
61 кризиса ждут в Америке пока его нет.
62 *IR: **Как? Он есть и продолжается вот уже несколько лет подряд.***

3.2.6 Strong Contradiction

Strong Contradiction (SCD) is similar to Weak Contradiction in that it expresses disagreement by simply contradicting the sentiment of or disputing the prior utterance. It also does not contain any explicit reference to the fact that it is a disagreement (such as repair or [agreement preface + "but"]), and is not necessarily hesitated or paused.

SCD is spoken by the IR, and is more aggressive than its weak counterpart because stronger vocabulary is used to emphasize the disagreement, and it is sometimes voiced with an aggressive tag question. This could be due to this IR's particular style, however, as most of her utterances are aggressive.

Excerpt (18) is an example of SCD. The contradiction is made strong by its being designed with an aggressive tag question, and by the antagonistic tone of voice employed by the IR.

(18) [March 21]

196 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): [Они] и здесь уберут режим. Они и здесь его уберут. Но это не
197 значит, что они убьют Саддама Хусейна, аа:: что мы узнаем судьбу этого человека
198 или его сыновей.
199 *IR: **Но тем не менее, бен Ладен не был олицетворением режима "Талибан", да? А***

200 ***Саддам Хусейн. (0.5) это олицетворение своего собственного режима. И не убрав***

201 ***Саддама Хусейна, нельзя говорить о том, что покончено с его режимом=***

202 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): =Но поэтому [( )]

203 *IR:* ***[Только] мертвый Саддам Хусейн, это (0.5) как бы***

204 ***решение проблемы.***

3.2.7 Disagreement By Question

The last strong form of disagreement found in the corpus is Disagreement by Question (DQ). Although DQ uses an interrogative form to disagree, the questions employed are often more like assertions than actual probes for information. The questions are aggressive, and have strong preferences for agreement. DQ is an IR form, and is spoken in response to another kind of disagreement.

Take excerpt (19), for example. A disagreement about which currency is better - the Euro or the US Dollar - is under way. The IR is arguing for the supremacy of the Euro, while the IE (Bogaturov) favours the US Dollar. In line 88, the IR voices her disagreement by DQ. This is a legitimate but aggressive question, whose function is to make the IE answer in a way that contradicts himself and gives more validity to the IR's side of the argument. This sentiment is continued in lines 95 and 97. The tag question in line 97 strongly prefers agreement/yes, which seems odd, as it will prove the IR's point. However, this DQ is almost a mockery of Bogaturov; she is anticipating what the IR will say and says it sarcastically herself. But she has taken his side of the argument to the extreme. He isn't explicitly saying the US economy is the best in the world - just

that the US Dollar is stronger than the Euro. By polarizing his argument the IR makes it seem somewhat absurd and unbelievable. She prefers agreement here so that the IE will voice the polarized version of his position, representing himself as extreme and a little ridiculous, and thus lose the argument. This IR uses this technique at other places in the interview, namely lines 118, 300, 305, and 309.

(19) [March 21]

81 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): =Игра на повышение евро, это совершенно значимая, официальная
82 вещь. Она ведется и вполне сознательно уже несколько месяцев. Евро, неплохая
83 валюта, никто не говорит что это по другому. hh Но что евро превосходит аа:
84 доллар (.) или что может легко превзойти доллар, этого не говорят даже самые
85 горячие сторонники евро. hh Поэтому вот это вот было аа:: пропаганда поход ( )
86 "Сбрасывайте доллары, покупайте евро" это на этом выиграли только те, кто
87 занимался обменными курсами hh в Российской Федерации. Сей[час]
88 *IR:* ***[А в Ев]ропе***
89 ***[кто выиграл?]***
90 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): [Сейчас] Да Европа живет своей жизнью. М::ы про Европе
91 судим по тому, как она представляется в наших средствах массовой информации, на
92 которые можно, как известно, влиять. hh И поэтому:: не надо делать резких
93 движений. Не то что была сила отлично. hh Ну: пока что вот так говорить, что евро
94 сильнее, чем доллар, [ну нет такого пока в мире.]
95 *IR:* ***[А каково состояние американской экономики?]***
96 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): Американская экономика, она::: [оо:: испытывается]
97 *IR:* ***[лучше всех в мире, да?]***=
98 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): =Я-я-не скажу что она лучше чем всех в мире, но, в общем, до сих
99 пор это локомотиво мировой экономики.

CHAPTER 4 - DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

1. Discussion

In Chapter 3, the analysis described the forms and local contexts of each type of agreement and disagreement existing in the corpus. In this section I will expand on that analysis to show how these forms function with each other to

produce unique episodes within interviews. What will be described here, then, are agreement and disagreement sequences (as opposed to forms).

There are four types of sequences to describe, which are situated on a continuum of interaction styles ranging from Collaboration to Opposition. Collaborations exist here as either sequences with No Dispute (affiliation sequences or manipulated sequences) or sequences with Practical Disputes, and Oppositions exist as either Moderate Disputes or Intense Disputes. I will describe this typology of sequences in the following sections, providing examples of how they relate to the interviews studied.

1.1 Collaboration Sequences

1.1.1 No Dispute

Two varieties of Collaboration sequences characterized by No Dispute were found in the corpus - Affiliation Sequences and Manipulated Sequences.

1.1.1.1 Affiliation Sequences

Affiliation Sequences are episodes consisting of lengthy prefaced questions (performed by the IR) that border on being assertions. In performing these utterances the IR is not oriented to neutrality and shows their perspective in the question prefaces, which serve as preference features. They are followed by responses in which the IE performs Affiliation by implicitly agreeing with the question preface (which was an expression of the IR's perspective), by reformulating its sentiment in their answer or as a preface or coda to their answer.

The December 4 interview is characterized by Affiliation Sequences, excerpt 20 being one such example. In line 103 the IR is changing topics, shifting the discussion to the creation of transport corridors between Russia and Asia. This question followed by a question coda is much like an assertion, and has a preference for agreement. Voskresensky complies with this preference, reformulating the sentiment of the question coda in his response. The next IR utterance, a prefaced question (lines 125-41) similarly is much like an assertion and prefers agreement. Voskresensky also affiliates with this statement, although his agreement here is prefaced by some disaffiliation (lines 142-148).

(20) [December 4]

103 *IR:* hh *Ну вы знаете я хотел бы вас попросить* hh *несколько слов сказать о:: mm::*
104 *перспективе создания транспортных коридоров.* hh *Это новое аа: так сказать*
105 *направление международного сотрудничества сравнительно новая.* hh *И здесь*
106 *пространство России и ее географическое и геополитическое положение между*
107 hh *Востоком и Западом* hh *открывает большие перспективы.*
108 ВОСКРЕСЕНСКИЙ (IE): Ну это:: аа: <очень перспективная крайне важная но непростая
109 задача>. hh Крайне перспективная и важная это понятно, потому что скажем,
110 уникальное географическое положение России фактически делает ее hh транс-и-
111 оо::-физическим трансконтинентальным мостом между Европой hh и Азией. hh Но
112 есть и сложности = Это колоссальные территории, hh для развития такой-таков-
113 таких проектов нужна аа:: оо:: развитая инфраструктура нужны очень большие
114 инвес-вес-инвестиционные, вложения<. hh Аа:: в::се проекты скажем модернизации
115 Транссиба, БАМа связаны с тем что Россия< позиционирует себя как
116 трансконтинентальную державу. hh Аа:: и скажем сегодняшние железнодорожные
117 проекты которые должны связать hh аа:: Южную, Северную Корею, Россию и

118 сответственно Европу, с этим связаны. Но у Китая есть и альтернативные проекты,
119 hh аа:: которой::: в которых Россия заинтересована. Но она заинтересована в-в-в
120 том, чтобы она была включена (.) в эти проекты. hh Если говорить об Индии, то:: во
121 время hh аа: вот аа:: визита который проходит сейчас визита Президента, hh будет
122 рассматриваться вопрос о трансграничном коридоре Север-Юг, hh в частности с о
123 использованием аа::: с о взаимодействии с Ираном. hh Это очень важно для
124 развития экономического сотрудничества между Россией и Индией.
125 *IR: hhh А вот теперь когда уже есть над тем и характер нашего разговора я*
126 *объявляю номера при моей связи со студий,* hh *Вы можете позвонить а задать*
127 *вопрос hh а нашему собеседнику а чуть позже у нас будет еще один собеседник ( )*
128 hh *представлю.* hh *Значит один телефон 900 594192* hh 900 594192 *и второй*
129 *телефон 900 536766 код Москвы 095.* hh *Теперь тт:: вы знаете мы говорим о:: (.)*
130 *материальном сотрудничестве (.)*hh *с Китаем и с Индией = Но есть, на мой*
131 *взгляд, <еще один момент>.* hhh *Аа:: но: Я (0.5) постарше вас, я помню времена,*
132 *когда* hhh *Россия н::о то есть Советский Союз тогда еще был (.) в положении*
133 *своего рода старшего брата. который оказывал экономическую помощь Китаю и*
134 *Индии.* hhh *Сейчас Китай экономически от нас ушел далеко вперед это все*
135 *признают,* hhh *но::, аа:: на мой взгляд, и Индия нас обходит-аа: на повороте по:* hh
136 *в развитии особенно* hh *электроники, новых технологий, и по (.) динамике*
137 *экономического роста, хотя* hh *мы свои (0.5) плюс четыре процента в год тоже*
138 *имеем.* hhh *Аа: нет ли смысла:: более пристально присмотреться именно к*
139 *методам (.) экономических реформ?* hh *У нас часто говорят тот о:: жесткой*
140 *вертикали власти в Китае,* hh *еще о чем-то.* hh *Я говорю именно об*
141 *экономической стороне дела.*
142 ВОСКРЕСЕНСКИЙ (IE): hh Ну вы знаете:, я прежде всего не склонен: аа: бить в грудь и
143 говорить что в России все очень плохо::, я думаю что мы: достаточно многое
144 сделали и hh страны нужно сравнивать аа: их можно сравнивать по общим
145 показателям = А скажем:, понятно что Китай просто колоссальная страна с

146 колоссальным населением, hh со:: в этом плане она просто на первом месте в мире
147 стоит. hh Но есть другие показатели, скажем, доход на душу населения = Здесь
148 скажем в отношении России все не так плохо. hh Но вы (.) заметили (.) совершенно
149 (.) верно, hh аа:: <сегодня очень важна>, и не только с точки зрения экономики, но и
150 с точки зрения психологии, и вообще, аа:-жизни обычного человека, динамика
151 экономического развития. hh И здесь надо сказать, и Китай (.) Китай в большей
152 степени, Индия в меньшей степени, но также (.) достигла очень впечатляющих
153 результатов. hh Вот это очень важное. hh К чему нужно присмотреться? Я думаю
154 что главная (.) вещь, которую мы< hh мы не можем заимствовать конкретные аа::
155 экономические вещи просто, потому что Россия находится на другом этапе своего
156 развития< hh и аа: политического, и экономического. hh Но к чему мы должны
157 внимательно присмотреться, это к (.) mm:: <стратегии> (.) экономического развития.
158 Скажем, в <<Китае< и в Индии такая стратегия разработана, и она проводится в
159 день-вот аа:: в:: жизнь день за днем, год за годом.>> hh А вот с этим у нас
160 проблемы.

This sequence follows the following format:

IR: Question-Question Coda (contains strong preference) - lines 103-7

IE: Affiliation - lines 108-24

IR: Question Preface-Question (contains strong preference) - lines 125-41

IE: DGAG (disaffiliation + affiliation) - lines 142-60

The first IR question-question coda serves the function of making an assertion of opinion on the topic, and the ensuing IE Affiliation agrees with that assertion. The next IR question preface-question also serves the function of asserting the IR's opinion, and is also followed by agreement.

That the December 4 interview is characterized by these sequences is consistent with the personal profiles of the IR and the IEs. Semenov, through his lengthy question prefaces bordering on assertions, shows that he wishes to portray the topic of the interview in a positive light. By doing this he also supports the government's decision to pursue trilateral relations with China and India. He speaks favorably about his country, such as when he points out that there was a time when Russia was a big brother to China and India and helped them economically. He also recognizes that now that as China and India have moved ahead of Russia in this way, Russia must examine her economic situation. Semenov believes India can positively contribute to Russia in terms of both culture and politics and hopes for increased cooperation between Russia and India in the future. He believes the time has come for India to join OSCE.

The manner in which Semenov expresses himself reflects his status as an experienced, accomplished IR. He shows his point of view explicitly (such as in the above example), confidently uses moves that could spark opposition (such as in lines 130-2 where he speaks condescendingly to the IE), and steps out of role to agree with and expand on IE utterances.

Voskresensky is optimistic about international partnerships in general, and thinks Russia, India, and China have the basis for a partnership (economic, technical and military interests). He speaks more on the topic of China, and therefore either favours this aspect of the partnership or is more informed of it. This is in contrast to the other IE, who is a specialist on India. Voskresensky goes

against the IR's preference features and defends Russia. He thinks India should join OSCE, but recognizes that there are stereotypes that might prevent it.

Bongard-Levin talks extensively about India's success, similarities between Russia and India, and their good relationship. He thinks India should join OSCE. As Bongard-Levin is the second IE, he is not given as much time to answer questions as Voskresensky and thus his views are not as developed.

Voskresensky, Bongard-Levin, and Semenov have congruent political beliefs. It is thus not surprising that agreement predominates in this interview.

1.1.1.2 Manipulation Sequences

Manipulation Sequences are episodes where the IR interrupts the IE to upgrade or affiliate, with the intention of either emphasizing certain points that they want to see receiving more attention or steering the conversation in a certain direction. It is for this reason that I have termed these episodes Manipulation Sequences. All the IR attempts to manipulate the discussion in this manner were successful here.

The March 20 interview contained a number of Manipulation Sequences, such as the following in excerpt 21. The IR and IE had just been discussing the military strategies used by Iraq and the US, when the IR asked to what extent the weather will influence the progress of the US army. While the IE is answering, the IR interrupts with Affiliation to emphasize a potential vulnerability the US may face (line 148). This is accepted with Direct Agreement, and when that agreement is expanded on the IR interrupts yet again with another Affiliation to emphasize the same point (line 154). This is also accepted, but this time with

Same Evaluation. This same pattern is repeated yet again (lines 158-165), although this time Affiliation is produced in turn.

(21) [March 20]

141 *IR: = Аа: скажите насколько вот по вашему мнению как опытного военного:: аа::*
142 *mm: насколько влиять самые (1.0) плохие независимые погодные условия сейчас*
143 *(.) хотя бы на продвижение с пехота::: hh морской hhhh Соединенны Штаты?*
144 ШАРАВИН (IE): Аа:: безусловно, (1.0) погодные условия влияют. И hh аа: иракцам,
145 проживающим в этой местности, гораздо легче переносить hh аа: вот эти аа::
146 пыльные бури. hh Это на самом деле действительно: аа:: большое такое
147 психологическое испытание и[:::]
148 *IR: [деморализует] их просто=*
149 ШАРАВИН (IE): =Да, это физическая большая нагрузка на военных.hh Аа:: и:: конечно иракская
150 страна тоже испытывает эти нагрузки, но hh давайте вспомним (.) аа:: (1.0) аа: зиму
151 hh сорок первого года под Москвой<. О::дно дело сибирякам было переносить те
152 морозы, хотя они так же мерзли, так же им было холодно другое дело немцам было.
153 hh Вот аа:: это примерно то[же самое]
154 *IR: [это тоже самое]*
155 ШАРАВИН (IE): Да, это примерно то же самое. hh Аа:::: вот- природные факторы:, безусловно, не на
156 стороне (0.5) США. hh И не случайно американцы и:: Великобритания стремились
157 как можно быстрее начать операцию, потому что природа их подгоняла.
158 *IR: Еще (вот) аа: будет еще Ирак бури через несколько недель еще к песчаным*
159 *бурям:: прибавится:: высокая температура.*
160 ШАРАВИН (IE): Конечно, это очень плохо, это снижает аа:: hh аа:: эффективность аа::
161 аа:: боевой техники, hh и:: моторы работают хуже, и вот этот песок проникает
162 буквально везде. hh Это очень неприятно, но аа: должен сказать, что (0.5) и на
163 иракскую армию все это тоже будет действовать, она (1.0) не волшебная. hh

164 Несмотря на то, что она привыкла к подобной жаре, но все равно и: тоже нагрузки

165 будут (.) очень велики.

In sum, this Manipulation Sequence contains the following forms:

IR: Question - lines 141-3

IE: Answer - lines 144-7

IR: Affiliation (interrupted) - line 148

IE: Direct Agreement - lines 149-53

IR: Same Evaluation - line 154

IE: Same Evaluation - lines 155-7

IR: Affiliation - lines 158-9

IE: Affiliation - lines 160-5

The IR Affiliations and Same Evaluations serve the function of emphasizing certain points that the IR wants to be discussed, and the IE agreement that follows these forms shows acceptance of the emphasis and a willingness to elaborate on these points.

The IR's desire to emphasize points describing potential vulnerabilities of the US in this example are consistent with her overall position, which does not support the war in Iraq. She introduces the interview by saying the war has started only five hours ago and already it is understood that the US will gain an easy victory and that Sadam Hussein does not have a chance to save himself. All her questions that encode preference features prefer an answer that emphasizes the severity, length, and devastation of the war. This often includes mention of the strength of coalition forces. The only time where preference features would

lead to discussion of the vulnerability of the US is when she talks about how the weather will not be on their side. This shows that she either thinks personally or is oriented towards a negative, unjust, immoral portrayal of the war. Often she will encourage the IR to talk on a certain point via upgrading to steer the conversation in this direction. That Balaeva expresses this position on a state owned Russian radio station is not surprising, given that the Russian government did not support the Iraq war.

Sharavin (the IE), on the other hand, discusses the war from the point of view of tactics and strategy. This is consistent with his position at IPMA, an institute dealing in the study, analysis, and forecasting of issues involving military sciences. Even when Sharavin is asked questions that have moral implications he does not emphasize the humane aspect of the war, but sticks to the military level. This implies he is somewhat detached from the social implications of war in this interview and is oriented to talking about it from a strategic point of view. Given this, he is a strange choice of guest to have on an interview advertised under such an emotionally charged title ("The Suppression of the Morale of Iraqi Soldiers is the Main Aim of the First Stage of Military Operations Against Iraq").

Because of the emotional detachment of Sharavin, the IR must resort to manipulative techniques. Her questions do not always give her the type of response she seeks, so she must steer the issues and emphasize certain points to ensure that the social aspects of the war will also be discussed. She does this by upgrading and affiliating.

1.1.2 Practical Dispute

Practical Dispute is a Collaboration sequence with the function of clarifying points that are left unclear (as opposed to a dispute that exists purely for the sake of argument). In this type of dispute, orientation to the interview is still first and foremost, as the participants are not disputing to further any personal agenda but are attempting to repair and clarify points that are some cause of confusion. The disputes cease when the points in question have been clarified, here not taking more than two or three turns, and the forms used are weak and polite. The IR takes the initiative for starting and ending Practical Disputes.

This pattern exists twice in this corpus, once in the December 3 interview and once in the March 20 interview. What follows is an example of a Practical Dispute from the December 3 interview. The IE, Safranchuk, had just been answering a question about cooperation between China and Russia, and commented on how more joint projects are needed to make the relationship between the two countries more egalitarian. The IR then, in line 101, interjects with "But there already are a few of these projects", which leads the IE to clarify his point. The IR interjects once more to have the IE explain his longer-term vision of cooperation for the future (line 111), which is acknowledged with token agreement.

(22) [December 3]

101 *IR: Но уже существует несколько таких [несколько проектов].*
102 САФРАНЧУК (IE): [hhhh]h Аа: сейчас есть три таких проекта. Первый это
103 строительство в: Китае аа: атомной электростанции которое (.) аа: идет. Второй
104 это строительство аа: трубопровода для транспортировки российской нефти аа: в
105 Китай, hh аа: и третий, это "Газпром" выиграл аа:: тендер hh на строительство

106 внутри Китая (.) газопровода из западных аа: в восточные провид-провинции Китая.
107 Hhh Но это тоже не-не то чтобы сверхкрупные проекты, они опять (все)
108 ориентированы на то, hh аа: по крайней мере !два из них!. Hhh аа: строительство
109 АЭС это по дешевке купить российские ядерные технологии<, строительство
110 газопровода из России в Китай это качать (.) российскую (.) нефть.
111 *IR: hh Но если учесть что: аа: собственно говоря товарооборот у нас развивается*
112 *успешно только последные два года, можно говорить наверно о том что это*
113 *только начало пути: и: что возможно еще родит перемена.*
114 САФРАНЧУК (IE): hhh Наверно (.) аа: можно говорить о том что перемена возможна,
115 !перемена всегда возможна! ( ) до в конце пути. Но: аа: опять же. В строгом под
116 шифром если смотреть формалистке (.) все замечательно у нас плюс большой с
117 Китаем товарооборот hh и буд-там поставляем более технологические товары чем
118 они но (.)hh
119 *IR: [u huh] ((acknowledgement token))*
120 САФРАНЧУК (IE): но если поставить на динамику и полоплеку и тех цифр то отношение к нам
121 китайских экономистов hh то: этих цифры выглядят гораздо менее радужно.

This sequence, then consists of:

IR: Weak Contradiction (WCD) - line 101

IE: Disagreement with Agreement Preface (AGDG) - lines 102-10

IR: Weak Contradiction (WCD) - lines 111-3

IE: Disagreement with Agreement Preface (AGDG) - lines 114-8

IR: Token Agreement (TA) line 119

IE: (Disagreement with Agreement Preface continued) - lines 120-

1

The first WCD has the function of voicing a misunderstanding, which leads to a clarification of that point via AGDG. When this remark leads to further confusion, the IR voices her misunderstanding yet again with another WCD. The point is clarified with AGDG, and the IR shows her acceptance and understanding of the clarification with a TA.

Reasons for the IR to initiate this Collaboration sequence are apparent when looking at the transcript, background information found on the participants, and the role of the media in Russian society (Chapter 1, section 2.2). Throughout the December 3 interview the IR is oriented to affiliation, cooperation, and to portraying the topic (relations between Russia, India, and China) in a positive light. This is apparent when looking at the preponderance of IR turns that prefer positive answers on the topic, as well as her upgrades. Her desire to portray Russia and trilateral relations with India and China in a positive light is consistent with the traditional view of the Russian media, namely being to promote the government's ideology and policies. When looking at her area of specialty (financial and business interviews), it follows that she would be likely to assume this more established role of the IR in a more unfamiliar setting (political news interviews), as opposed to being experimental and producing interviews of the newer, more scandalous type.

It is not surprising, then, that her interview contains this sequence pattern. By disagreeing, the IR is asking for clarification on a point that could potentially portray Russia in a negative light. And by selecting WCD in particular the IR is adhering to her desire to affiliate and cooperate, in that WCD is a weak form with

the function of voicing misunderstanding (as opposed to being confrontational). Thus, she is required to disagree on some level in order to present the topic favorably, yet she ensures that this disagreement is performed in a way that is constructive, as opposed to existing merely for the sake of dispute.

The IE, on the other hand, is wary of trilateral relations between Russia, India and China. He expresses the view that the triad won't work as a strategic construction because China and India do not want only Russia to be their partner; they would prefer to develop relations with the US. However, he does express the view that China and India are very important allies for Russia, as the three share more similar points of view on terrorism than they do with the US. Safranchuk believes cooperation with China and India would help Russia not only for bilateral relations with those two countries, but also, and more importantly, that it would strengthen Russia's reputation on the international scene. Russia will be perceived as stronger and more successful if she has such allies as China and India, and thus it is most important for Russia to use China and India as means to strengthen international relations, diplomatic potential, and global politics. Supporting this is the point that these relations would strengthen Russia's position in Asia and the Middle East. Safranchuk thinks Russia has better economic relations with China than with India.

This is consistent with the fact that he works for an organization emphasizing Russia's partnership with the US. It is natural that one working for Russian-American cooperation would be biased towards the value to the US as an ally, and would see the importance of Russia building a reputation for being a strong

country. When dealing with the US this strength could give Russia a diplomatic edge (Russia would be seen as a more valuable ally if she were stronger, and would have more leverage in negotiations).

Thus, the IR and the IE hold different points of view on the topic. It is in this light that one should view the disagreements of Safranchuk. Although he disagrees and does not comply with preferences frequently in this interview, it is likely not due to a desire to be uncooperative, but because he has to disagree in order to express his opinion. This sequence where he disagrees to clarify his point of view reflects this. Considering that the IR and the IE have different agendas (the IR wishes to portray the topic positively, while the IE does not agree with this positive portrayal), they are collaborating as much as their own personal agendas will allow.

1.2 Opposition Sequences

The interviews analyzed contained two types of Opposition Sequences - Moderate Dispute and Intense Dispute.

1.2.1 Moderate Dispute

The Moderate Dispute is a type of Opposition sequence where interview participants are more oriented to expressing their individual points of view than they are to their roles as answerers of questions. This results in a brief and mild form of dispute that here does not last longer than four turns.

This corpus contains one example of the Moderate Dispute, and it exists between the two IEs in the December 3 interview (see excerpt 23). Prior to this excerpt, the IR had just introduced the new IE (Makienko), and asked him if he

thought Russia's relationship with India was developing more positively than its relationship with China. Makienko answered by saying that more exchange exists between Russia and China, but that the projects with India are more interesting. This sparks something in Safranchuk, who at that points steps out of role to "make a remark" ("сделаю ремарку") (line 143). He does frame his comment as only a "remark", which, combined with the form's shape (AGDG) weakens it somewhat - although it still amounts to a challenge. Safranchuk is not prepared for a lengthy, indepth dispute, however, as after Makienko's defense he immediately backs down. He does so with AGDG again - this gives validity to both their points, so Makienko is appeased and Safranchuk's point is still made. The AGDG is accepted and the dispute closes with DA.

This dispute is not lengthy and is initiated and exited fairly quickly (the whole episode only consists of four turns), and contains weak forms. It could even be argued that this dispute also exists, like the Practical Dispute, to clarify a point. What differentiates the two types however is that in this type the participants are not oriented to their roles as IEs who merely answer IR questions within their allotted turns, but they step out of their roles to engage in this dispute.

(23) [December 3]

143 САФРАНЧУК (IE1): .hhhh aa:: М-можно я здесь одну ремарку сделаю что hhh aaa:: с

144 одной стороны да это новая парадигма военно-технического сотрудничества = С

145 другой стороны. (.) Индия на основе этой новой парадигмы а военно-технического

146 сотрудничества пытается влиять (.) на российскую политику экспорта

147 вооружений.hhh Например. когда возникают разговоры (.) о том чтобы

экспортировать какую-то военную технику в Пакистан< hhhh Индия (1.0) очень
жестко против этого выступает, и не только по политическим мотивам потому что аа
Индия и Россия это стратегические партнеры hh а они как раз ссылаются на то, что
поставляемая в Индию техника это фактически техника совместного производства
hhh аа и:: совместные разработки.hhh И они-они угрожают выйти из этих
проектов.hhh Поэтому с одной стороны да это новая парадигма<. (0.5) Но с другой
стороны это определенная аа зависимость, hhh и:: что ли (0.5) как бы фиксация так
называемого индийского аа гетто (.) для российского экспорта вооружений = Здесь
есть по крайней мере двойное влияние.
МАКИЕНКО (IE2): hhh Но: в этом ничего страшного нет. Аа::: отношения покупателя и
продавца это всегда взаимное влияние и взаимные обязательства.hhhhh аа::::
Индия влияет на Россию я думаю что Россия тоже влияет на индийскую полни-
политику в области импорта вооружений в том числе через Китай кстати говоря.hh
Тот же самый Су-30-МКИ никогда бы не состоялся если бы hh не было больших hh
поставок вооружений в Китай. (1.0) hhh В::от. А:: что касается Пакистана то это
вообще-то вопрос технологий на мой взгляд.hh Технологий торговых. Я думаю, что
российские uh:: технологии и оборонные а российская uh:: hh продукция в том числе
и оборонная могут оказаться в Пакистане (.) несмотря на индийскую позицию = Это-
это технологический вопрос.
САФРАНЧУК (IE1): [hhh]А-А-А- как раз имею виду что:: оо:: с моей точки
зрения в случае с Индией (.) аа:: может быть даже больше чем в случа:е с Китаем

169 (.) именно потому, что в Индию дет-идет более высокотехнологичное оборудование
170 hhh наши отношения выходят (.) за парадигму (.) торговец (.) покупатель и
171 становятся чем-то большим.hhh С одной стороны это хорошо< (.) а с другой
172 стороны это:: и:::и не очень хорошо.
173 МАКИЕНКО (IE2): [Да] конечно это
174 обязательство.

This sequence consists of the following forms:

IE1: Disagreement with Agreement Preface (AGDG) (interrupted) - lines 143-56

IE2: Strong Contradiction (SCD) - lines 157-66

IE1: Disagreement with Agreement Preface (AGDG) - lines 167-72

IE2: Direct Agreement (DA) - lines 173-4

The first AGDG serves the function of a weak challenge, made out-of-turn. It is responded to by a defensive remark in the form of SCD. After that Safranchuk backs down, via an AGDG, and the dispute is closed with a DA.

The cause of this moderate dispute can be seen when looking at the backgrounds of Safranchuk and Makienko. As illustrated in section 1.1.2, Safranchuk is wary of trilateral relations between Russia, India and China, and thus is eager to point out its non-egalitarian nature. Makienko, however, holds a slightly different point of view. He expresses the opinion that Russia has a more developed trade relationship with China, but with India the projects are more interesting. He thinks that Russia has already started a new type of military-technological cooperation with India, which he thinks is significant as a new

paradigm of cooperation. He appears to be more optimistic about cooperation between Russia and India than Safranchuk. So, then, the Moderate Dispute is most likely an effect of two IEs with differing view points who are less oriented to answering the IR's questions than they are to expressing their points of view.

1.2.2 Intense Dispute

This corpus contains three examples of the Intense Dispute, all of which occurred in the March 21 interview. This type is stronger and longer than the Moderate Dispute, as it is initiated abruptly with strong disagreement, spans many turns and thus develops the argument more fully, and uses strong and weak forms throughout. The IR begins these disputes with strong disagreement and initiates their ending with strong agreement (either Direct Agreement or Same Evaluation).

Excerpt (24) is an example of an Intense Dispute. The IR, in her opening question immediately preceding line 19, has asked Bogaturov if he thinks America is attacking Iraq for oil or as a strategic move for Bush's 2004 election campaign. The question prefers the later alternative, which Bogaturov complies with (lines 19-29). However, his answer nonetheless invokes Strong Contradiction (lines 30-5), and thus an Intense Dispute has begun. The IR does not appear to be oriented to her task of uncovering the IE's perspective here and is instead intent on expressing how she feels about the issues being discussed.

(24) March 21

19 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): Я думаю, что (1.0) одно не исключает другое. Америка все равно
20 бьется за нефть, это очень важно. Но одновременно президент Буш бьется за
21 переизбрание (1.0) аа: действительно (.) президентом на следующих выборах. Но
22 только я думаю что война с Ираком это все-таки второй шаг, а первый был сделан,

когда началась hhh вторая афганская война. Это было год назад. Но в принципе, электоральный (.) фактор, аа: несомненно, сильно влияет на президента Буша. Расчет президента не очень сложный, (1.0) аа:: короткая (.) победоносная война, если одна удастся, (1.0) и облик сильного президента закрепляется, и всегда аа: хочется примкнуть к сильному. Это обеспечит ему чисто психологически (.) приток дополнительного количества: голосов колеблющихся избирателей. Так было всегда, так есть, это старый электоральный закон.

IR: *hh Но при всем при этом: (.) отец (0.7) нынешнего Джорджа Буша, Джордж Буш старший, hh в свое время, проведя блестящую кампанию "Буря в пустыне", hh аа:: примерно два года спустя проиграл (.) Биллу Клинтону, который >мало того что никакого отношения к кампании не имел<, но и никакого неики-некако- каков политический играл не солидного не имел. hh Тем не менее, Джордж Буш старший потерпел сокрушительное поражение на выборах.*

БОГАТУРОВ (IE): Да, но это было стечение совершенно специфических обстоятельств.

Во-первых, hh аа:: Буш-старший о::ткровенно (.) казался человеком пожилым и слабеющим в смысле состояния здоровья. Во-вторых, к моменту его оо:: попытки выйти на выборы во второй раз< аа:: рес-республиканцы правили в Америке уже три администрации подряд. И в избирателях накопилось то, что называется усталостью от администрации, им до смерти надоели старые (.) лица. И:: hh с другой стороны, Клинтон очень грамотно это ощутил (1.5) и сумел построить с одной стороной (.) политику аа:: именно кампанию предвыборную на выдвижении свежих (1.5) аа:: лозунгов. Аа: с другой стороной он настолько (1.5) хитро запаковал старое консервативное содержание в новые освежающие (.) лозунги, что (.) фактически не очень сильно его (1.0) подержанная программа отличалась от программы (.) аа: старшего президента Буша. Он просто его обхитрил чисто вот (.) стратегически и таким образом выиграл. Здесь ситуация существенно другая, hh Буш (0.5) м:ладший как раз производит впечатление человека очень энергичного, очень молодого, очень перспективного. Но там: не все говорят что он достаточно хорошо подготовлен hh как аа: к ведению дел в международной политике, но о том, что он энергичный, смелый и перспективный, об этом пока говорят все.

IR: *Но: у Клинтона:: еще за Клинтона было один момент. И весьма существенный которого не упомянули. Я имею в виду экономическую ситуацию в стране. Экономика была в очень плохом состоянии, когда Буш старший сдавал дела.* (1.5)

БОГАТУРОВ (IE): Правильно. Но экономика сейчас будет играть скорее на президента Буша, потому что, (0.5) аа:: хотя и Клинтон был чрезвычайно успешным в

экономическом смысле президентом, но пока что никакого hh аа:: экономического спада за рушение признаков серьезного кризиса, несмотря на то, что все его кризиса ждут в Америке пока его нет.

IR: *Как? Он есть и продолжается вот уже несколько лет подряд.*

БОГАТУРОВ (IE): Ну, вот это, это такой кризис, который, как мне кажется, в Москве ощущается сильнее, чем в Америке. То есть не надо преувеличивать ну по моему признаки кризиса в Америке.

(1.5)

IR: *hh Нет, но простите::, (1.0) почем есть в Америке, почем есть в Москве:: если:::*

удреп-укрепляется евро, (0.5)

БОГАТУРОВ (IE): Н[у:]

IR: *[и] это показатель. (То есть в Европе значит смотреть так у думать да плохо счет экономика с Соединенными Штатами.)*

БОГАТУРОВ (IE): С вашего позволения, так, но не совсем. Потому что то что укрепляется евро, это то, что хочется думать европейцам, а то что аа: хочется (0.5) писать, и чтобы hh везде передавалось в Рос[сии. ((laughing))]

IR: *[hhh ((laughing))] Вот не надо. Вот люди, которые работают на рынках, (если) воз[мож]ность, они не-не-не то что мы считаем что должно быть так поэтому мы*

БОГАТУРОВ (IE): да

IR: *будем покупать hhh евро дороже чем доллар. Извините, (и еще) другими мотивами руководствуются=*

БОГАТУРОВ (IE): =Игра на повышение евро, это совершенно значимая, официальная вещь. Она ведется и вполне сознательно уже несколько месяцев. Евро, неплохая валюта, никто не говорит что это по другому. hh Но что евро превосходит аа: доллар (.) или что может легко превзойти доллар, этого не говорят даже самые горячие сторонники евро. hh Поэтому вот это вот было аа:: пропаганда поход ( ) "Сбрасывайте доллары, покупайте евро" это на этом выиграли только те, кто занимался обменными курсами hh в Российской Федерации. Сей[час]

IR: *[А в Ев]ропе [кто выиграл?]*

БОГАТУРОВ (IE): [Сейчас] Да Европа живет своей жизнью. М::ы про Европе судим по тому, как она представляется в наших средствах массовой информации, на которые можно, как известно, влиять. hh И поэтому:: не надо делать резких движений. Не то что была сила отлично. hh Ну: пока что вот так говорить, что евро сильнее, чем доллар, [ну нет такого пока в мире.]

94 IR: *[А каково состояние американской экономики?]*

95 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): Американская экономика, она::: [оо:: испытывается]

96 IR: *[лучше всех в мире, да?]=*

97 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): =Я-я-не скажу что она лучше всех в мире, но, в общем, до сих
98 пор это локомотиво мировой экономики. Нравится это, не нравится, но она в обшем
99 тащит за собой hh все остальные экономики. hh И хотя в там дейс-действительно
100 рано или поздно должен произойти обвал из-за ее самые виртуальные экономики,
101 экономики которые (.) надуть hh аа: за счет аа: вот аа: увеличения доли
102 нематериального производства. Потому что производство услуг, информации, hh
103 производство тех услуг которые не нужны строго говоря, дл-для ведения
104 нормальной жизни, hh вот это все приносит большие деньги но очень
105 спекулятивная экономика. Она должна рано или поздно дать какой то большой
106 сбор. Когда этот обвал наступит? Его ждут уже несколько лет подряд, но он все
107 пока что не наступает.

19 *108* IR: Он по чуть-чуть наступает. Так [понемножечку]

109 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): [Если он наступает] по чуть-чуть, это
110 совершенно [тоже]

111 IR: *[это нормальный кризис, да?]*

112 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): [да] это нормальный кри[зис,]

113 IR: *[это нормальный*
114 *кризис]*

115 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): [потому что это тот кризис] который ведет к разрешению
проблемы. А мы говорим о
116 кризисе, как об обвале. Об обломе.

117 IR: *Так. Значит, с точки зрения экономики, по большую мнению:,Джорджу Бушу*
118 *младшему ничего не грозит, (.) все нормально.*

119 (1.3)

120 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): H::y (1.0) вот придет в порядок. Трудности в пределах порядка.

121 IR: *M hum. Трудности в пределах нормы.*

122 БОГАТУРОВ (IE): Ну да.

This example of Intense Dispute consists of the following forms:

IE: Answer (complies with preference) - lines 19-29

IR: Strong Contradiction (SCD) - lines 30-5

IE: Disagreement with Agreement Preface (AGDG) - lines 36-52

IR: Upgrading (U) - lines 53-5

IE: Disagreement with Agreement Preface (AGDG) - lines 57-61

IR: Direct Disagreement (DD) - line 62

IE: Qualified Disagreement (QD) - lines 63-5

IR: Disagreement with Repair (DWR) - lines 67-8

IE: (tries to interrupt) - line 69

IR: (continues) - lines 70-1

IE: Disagreement with Repair (DWR) - lines 72-4

IR: Direct Disagreement (DD) (interrupted) - lines 75-7

IE: Token Agreement (TA) - line 78

IR: (continue) - lines 79-80

IE: Disagreement with Agreement Preface (AGDG) - lines 81-7

IR: Disagreement by Question (DQ) - line 88

IE: Weak Contradiction (WCD) - lines 89-93

IR: Disagreement by Question (DQ) - line 94

IE: Answer - line 95

IR: Disagreement by Question (DQ) - line 96

IE: Downgrade (DG) - lines 97-107

IR: Strong Contradiction (SCD) - line 108

IE: Response - lines 109-110

IR: Disagreement by Question (DQ) - line 111

IE: Same Evaluation (SE) - line 112

IR: SE - lines 113-4

IE: expand SE 115-6

IR: Disagreement by Question (DQ) - 117-8

IE: Downgrade (DG) - 120

IR: Same Evaluation (SE) - line 121

IE: Direct Agreement (DA) - line 122

As can be seen from the above outline of the forms used, the IR uses strong forms in the vast majority of her turns, while the IE uses weak forms and even TA in one instance.

The IR's personal position is that the US is not justified in waging war in Iraq and, moreover, she does not support the US in any sense. She expresses a negative opinion about past US presidents, saying that both George W. Bush and his father have had negative effects on the American economy, and maintains that the US economy is in a crisis while the Euro is rising. She often asks about other possibilities for things to have worked out in Iraq, such as talks with the sons of Sadam Hussein, and prefers "yes" answers to these questions - this shows her view that the present method the US has chosen is not the best one. She points out difficulties that the US will have in their plan to liquidate Sadam Hussein, illustrating how they still have not found Osama Bin Laden, and further says that the US cannot say they have beaten the Iraqi regime without finding its leader. She wants to talk about what will make the US people lose faith in their president, and is quick to agree with the similarity between US and Soviet propaganda

proposed by Bogaturov. Once again, it is not surprising that an interviewer on a state owned Russian radio station expresses these views given that the Russian government also does not support the war in Iraq. However, as this IR is more accomplished she is not afraid to express this in a less conventional manner. Thus, she initiates the dispute and uses stronger forms throughout.

The IE, on the other hand, is much more supportive of the US and their involvement in Iraq and recognizes the pros and cons of the military campaign. Bogaturov admits that Bush is fighting for oil and for success in his election campaign, but he does not appear to be "anti-American". In terms of his views on past and present American presidents, he considers George Bush senior to have had a weak, unhealthy image and to have been a poor economist, Bill Clinton as having a healthy, refreshing image and being a good economist, and George W. Bush seeming energetic, young, and strong. He thinks the Russian economy is worse than the US, and argues for the strength of the dollar over the Euro. He seems to support the US involvement in Iraq, in that he discounts other possibilities for solving the situation. He thinks the US plan will be effective in disposing the Iraqi regime. His support for the US is not without caution, however, as he does make parallels between how the Soviet government and the US used similar propaganda and discourse to mould public opinion.

These views are consistent with his position as director of AEFIR, an organization that encourages the use of Western methodology and employs foreign standards in their research in International Relations. The position of the IE is likely a second reason the March 21 interview contains Intense Dispute; not

only is the IR confident to experiment with a more controversial interview style but her IE holding such a different point of view from her makes it easy for her to engage in dispute.

1.2.3 Placement on the Continuum of Collaboration ~ Opposition

What has been presented in the analysis and discussion is a series of agreement and disagreement features that function as elements to categorize political news interviews. It happened to be the case that each interview studied belonged on a different point of a continuum, ranging from Collaborative to Oppositive (see Figure 1). The December 3 interview is featured twice on this continuum, as there are two different patterns of interaction - between the IR and the IE there are Practical Disputes, and between the two IEs there is Moderate Dispute. It is interesting that it is not the topic of the interview or solely the opinions of the interview participants that leads to the interview's placement on the continuum, but the degree to which the participants are oriented to exposing their points of view and accomplishing their personal agendas. Here I will use the term "aggressive" to denote an IR who actively portrays and/or defends their viewpoint and is thus oriented towards accomplishing a personal agenda, and an IE who actively maintains and defends their viewpoint (expressing their viewpoint is expected - it is their job as IE). The term "passive" will be used to denote an IR who is not more intent on accomplishing a personal agenda than asking questions, and an IE who does not actively maintain and defend their viewpoint.

Figure 1: Continuum of Collaboration ~ Opposition

Affiliation Dispute	Manipulation	Practical Dispute	Moderate Dispute	Intense
Dec. 4	March 20	Dec. 3	Dec. 4	March 21

The December 4 interview is situated on the Collaborative end of the continuum. In this interview both the IR and the IEs support trilateral cooperation between Russia, China and India, giving them congruent points of view. However, they differ in their level of aggressiveness. The IR is aggressive in that he often departs from his role as questioner to agree and expand on utterances, thus putting his desire to portray his point of view above his desire to ask questions. Voskresensky (here, IE1) is not aggressive, in that when he wants to answer in a manner that does not comply with the given preference features he is very vague and indirect and incorporates some aspect of affiliation into his answer. He also demonstrates his passivity in the one instance of disagreement in the interview where the IR very politely disagrees with him; here Voskresensky immediately acquiesces, doing Direct Agreement. Bongard-Levin (here, IE2) is more aggressive, in that he steps out of role to express to IE1 his opinion that time has come for India to join OSCE to IE1. This occurred after IE1 answered a question stating that the world may not yet be ready to accept India into OSCE

(this remark is not made as a disagreement, but rather couched as an expression of opinion).

So here collaboration predominates in part because all the participants share more or less congruent points of view, but also because of the fact that all participants are not equally aggressive. If IE1 were aggressive he (by the definition of the term) would have expressed his viewpoint more strongly at those times when the IR and IE2 expressed a slightly different sentiment than he voiced, thus leading to a different type of interview.

The March 20 interview, on the topic of the war in Iraq, is next in line on the continuum. In this interview the IR is against the war, whereas the IE expresses both its positive and negative aspects. Thus, the participants do not share a common opinion on the topic of the interview. However, collaboration still characterizes the interview. This coincides with a difference in the degree of aggressiveness of the participants. Here the IR is aggressive, in that she is oriented towards portraying the negative aspects of the war. She strays from her role as questioner to emphasize certain points by doing Affiliation and Upgrading, thus leading the conversation into the direction she wishes. The IE, on the other hand, is passive - he is not oriented to portraying the situation in Iraq in any particular way, and is happy to answer the IR's questions on whatever level she choses. Because of this difference the IR is able to manipulate the IE, and turn what could have been a clash resulting from different points of view into collaboration.

Interaction between the IR and the IEs in the December 3 interview is next on the continuum. The topic of this interview is trilateral cooperation between Russia, China and India. Here the IR supports this cooperation, whereas both IEs also support it but are less optimistic. However, the disputes between IR and IEs remain practical, situating this interaction on the collaborative end of the continuum. This coincides with the IR being passive (when contradicted she does not support her viewpoint, acquiescing to the opinion of the IEs) and the IEs being aggressive (they pursue disputes until their points have been clarified and established as the "last words"). Because of this the disputes remain collaborative. The IEs are able to have their points left as the final statements on the issues discussed, turning what could have been Opposition into a quick resolving of each Practical Dispute and moving on to the next phase of the interview.

Next on the continuum and crossing the line into opposition is an interaction pattern between the IEs in the December 3 interview. When the IEs are pitted against the IR they do collaborate. However, in the instance when they were pitted against each other their interaction was characterized not by collaboration but by Moderate Dispute. There are slight variations to how Safranchuk (here, IE1) and Makienko (here, IE2) view the topic. Safranchuk is less optimistic about the trilateral cooperation, and thinks that relations between Russia and China are more positive. Makienko, however, is more optimistic about the trilateral cooperation and thinks that India-Russia relations are more beneficial. Moreover, both participants are aggressive. This coincides with their

interaction being oppositive, instead of collaborative. They both are oriented to expressing their points of view to the point that a Moderate Dispute ensues even though it means breaking the turn structure of the interview, but they are not aggressive enough to keep voicing their opinions until the opposition becomes more intense.

On the oppositive end of the continuum is the interaction in the March 21 interview, on the topic of the war in Iraq. Here the IR is against the war, and does not support the American government or military in any sense. The IE, on the other hand, to some extent supports both the war and the American government. Both IR and IE are aggressive, in that they frequently depart from the question-answer sequence of the interview to express their opinions via agreement and disagreement. This more extreme aggressiveness of both IR and IE coincides with their interaction being at the oppositive end of the continuum. As both participants are very much oriented to expressing their points of view, and as these points of view differ, Intense Dispute characterizes this interview.

In sum, the degree to which dispute is present in these interviews is proportionate to the degree to which both participants are oriented to portraying differing points of view, thereby accomplishing conflicting agendas. When both participants are oriented to this (i.e., are aggressive), disputes are intense. If they are somewhat aggressive, the dispute is more moderate. If one participant is aggressive and the other is passive, the passive individual sacrifices expressing themselves for the sake of collaboration.

2. Conclusion

From the analyses performed on Anglo-Western news interviews (see Chapter 1, Review of Literature) it has been established that agreement is not common in English language media, but that when it does occur its most common form is an acknowledgement token. This is due to issues of neutrality - in the Anglo-Western context IRs are not entitled to state their opinions - and because of issues of structure - the IE responds to questions of the IR, not to statements of the IR. When agreement exists in forms other than the acknowledgement token in Anglo-Western interviews, it takes similar shapes to that of English language OC, namely downgrading, same evaluation, and upgrading. In Sai-hua Kuo's study (1994) on the call-in radio show, however, where neutrality was not an issue, agreement was more common. There it was found to occur as acknowledgement tokens, repetition, and upgrading.

Disagreement strategies and methods used to generate disagreement in Anglo-Western interviews are footing shifts, the unequal introduction of guests and topics, choice of questioning patterns, attacks on question prefaces, and the breaking of the turn structure. In the call-in radio show, common disagreement strategies are delay devices, mitigation, overlapping, and interruptions. Disagreements between IEs are less mitigated in the news interview than in OC in Anglo-Western culture. This is because they are more preferred and thus do not need to be forestalled, and because of the turn structure of the panel interview, by which the IEs address each other via the IR. Similarly, disagreements between IEs escalate in the news interview more quickly and freely than in OC, because

the IEs know that the IR will stop their disagreement and they do not need to negotiate their way out of it.

In the study on agreement and disagreement in the Russian news interview, it was found that agreement was fairly common. Strong agreement forms outnumbered weak forms 31 to 21; the weak variety being used predominantly by the IE, and the strong variety used by both IR and IE. Some forms used in Russian are similar to those used in English, such as Agreement with Disagreement Preface, Token Agreement, Downgrading, Same Evaluation, Direct Agreement, and Upgrading. A significant difference between English and Russian Same Evaluation is that while this form is weak in English, it is strong in Russian. A type of agreement was found to occur here that has not been documented in studies on English language interviews - that of Affiliation.

Disagreement was less common than agreement in the Russian corpus, and within that, weak disagreement outnumbered strong agreement 25 to 16. While in English studies common means found for initiating disagreement were footing shifts, unequal introduction of guests and topics, and attacks on question prefaces, this behavior did not occur in the Russian interviews. One tactic that the two languages do hold in common to generate disagreement, however, is the breaking of the turn structure. Disagreement in Russian is more mitigated than in English, as can be seen by the predominance of weak over strong forms. Furthermore, in the panel interviews disagreement between IEs was not common, only occurring in one episode of Moderate Disagreement.

There are some similarities between Russian and Anglo-Western agreement and disagreement. Both languages use some of the same forms, as indicated above, and both will break the turn structure to generate disagreement. There are also some significant differences between the two languages. In Anglo-Western interviews agreement is not common at all, and strong disagreement is often preferred. In these Russian interviews studied, however, agreement is common, and weak disagreements greatly outnumber strong disagreements.

The difference between the roles of Russian and Western radio is likely a key reason for this difference. One key role of radio in Western settings is audience entertainment. The more that audiences find shows entertaining, the greater the profits the broadcasting station will generate. In Russia, however, state owned radio has performed in Soviet times and still continues to some extent to perform more of a didactic role. This is due in part to the absence of a free market economy for much of Russia's recent history, and thus more of a focus on the radio station's objectives (i.e., instilling government ideology) than on audience entertainment.

The desire for radio for entertainment's sake leads to more adversarialness in broadcasts, which is caused by a greater number of strong disagreements. Deeply engrained in this tradition is the view that the IR should be as neutralistic as possible. The habit of having radio for didactic purposes, however, leads to less IR neutralism. In order to teach an audience, the IR must convey a perspective, which here was shown through agreement, weak disagreement, and lengthy question prefaces. Similarly, to emphasize and enforce that perspective,

which here was in all cases consistent with the official policy of the Russian government, the IR at times needs to use agreement devices such as Upgrading and Affiliation.

Given the above, it was interesting that in this corpus, with the exception of the December 4 interview, the IEs held points that were not congruent with that of the IR. In the December 3 interview the IEs did not view Russia's trilateral cooperation with India and China as favorably as the IR would have liked, and in the March 20 and March 21 interviews the IEs were more on the side of Americans than the IRs were. So why would a Russian state owned radio station select such guests? One explanation is that the managers of the station intended to give the appearance of more of a plurality of voices in the broadcasts, as this would be more in-line with the modern, more scandalous style of radio broadcasting, and potentially attract more listeners.

These differences raise the question of how a Russian IE would react to Western-style media. Coming from a background where agreements are common, where the IR is non-neutral, and where the goal of the interview is didactic (i.e., state owned Russian radio), and being in an environment where disagreements are more common, the IR is neutral, and the goal of the interview is entertainment could lead to some problems of miscommunication. For example, in this corpus it was found that Russians do not make much use of footing shifts or attacks on question prefaces. This could potentially lead to misunderstandings - would an English IR, in using a device intended to soften a disagreement (such as a footing shift), have their attempts at weakening a

disagreement misunderstood, thus leading to the Russian IE interpreting the remark as stronger than it was intended? Or would a Russian, who is accustomed to an IR who shows their perspective, be put off by an English IR who, in striving for neutrality, does not communicate their opinions as explicitly? Would a Russian IE who is used to an interview environment where agreement is fairly common be offended by an environment where IRs attempt to generate adversarilaness via more disagreements, not realizing that this is the norm for the Anglo-Western culture? Or perhaps Russians would be less equipped to respond to this adversarialness, because it is not as common in Russian interviews. I hypothesize "yes" to all the above questions, but to confirm this preliminary hypothesis it would be necessary to conduct an analysis on a larger corpus consisting of both Russian and English language data, and then compare those results with an analysis on interviews with Russian and Anglo-Western participants.

A better understanding of cross-cultural media relations between Russians and Anglo-Westerns may lead to improved diplomatic negotiations and conflict management. Agreement and disagreement are particularly important features for inter-cultural communication as their expression can show the presence or absence of solidarity, cooperation, affiliation, or a desire to work together with someone towards the achievement of a common goal. Therefore, if someone wants to express agreement but is not understood properly, it could lead to doubts of that person's desire to cooperate and affiliate. Or, if someone wants to disagree delicately so as not to offend but is not understood, communication and

cooperation could also break down. Thus, further studies on this topic would be valuable investments into more effective cross-cultural communication between Russians and English speaking Westerners - not only in the context of the media but also in business exchanges, academic cooperation, and everyday encounters.

In the discussion section a method of classifying news interviews based on four interaction patterns was created and developed. A further study would involve testing this method with a larger corpus of interviews, analyzing their interaction patterns and placing them on the continuum of Collaboration and Opposition. Their placement on this continuum could be used to answer questions about the interactants, the radio station that aired these interviews, and the evolution of radio shows.

References

Alber, Jennifer; O'Connell, Daneil & Kowal, Sabine. 2002. "Personal Perspective in TV News Interviews," in *Pragmatics*, 12(2): 257-271.

Arminen, Ilkka. 2000. "On the context sensitivity of institutional interaction," in *Discourse & Society*, 11(4): 435-458.

Boxer, Diana. 2002. "Discourse Issues in Cross-Cultural Pragmatics," in *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22: 150-167.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S.C. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Useage*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Clayman, Steven E. 2002. "Disagreements and third parties: dilemmas of neturalism in panel news interviews," in *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34: 1385-1401.

Clayman, Steven E. 1993. "Reformulating the question: A device for answering /not answering questions in news interviews and press conferences" in Text*, 13(2): 159-188.*

Clayman, Steven E. 1992. "Footing in the achievement of neutrality: the case of news-interview discourse", in *Talk at Work – Interaction in institutional settings*. Drew, Paul & Heritage, John (eds). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 163-198.

Clayman, Steven & Heritage, John. 2002. *The News Interview: journalists and public figures on the air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Collier, Mary Jane (ed.). 2001. *Constituting Cultural Difference Through Discourse*. London, Thousand Oaks (CA) and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Connor-Linton, Jeff. 1999. "Competing communicative styles and crosstalk: A multi-feature analysis", in *Language in Society*, 28: 25-56.

Creswell, John W. 2003. *Research Design. Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches*. 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications. 27-48.

Dickerson. 2001. "Disputing with care – Analyzing interviewees' treatment of interviewers' prior turns in televised political interviews," in *Discourse Studies*, 3(2): 203-223.

Drew, Paul & Heritage, John (eds). 1992. *Talk at work – Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 3-101.

Flowerdew, John. 1999. "Face in cross-cultural political discourse," in Text 19(1): 3-23.

French, P., & Local, J. 1983. "Turn-competitive incomings." Journal of Pragmatics, *7:17, 17-38.*

Greatbatch, David. 1992. "On the management of disagreement between news interviewees," in Talk at Work – Interaction in institutional settings. *Drew, Paul & Heritage, John, (eds). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 268-301.*

Heritage, John. 2002. "The limits of questioning: negative interrogatives and hostile question content," in Journal of Pragmatics, *34: 1427-1446.*

Hester, Stephen & Francis, David. 2000. "Ethnomethodology, conversation analysis, and 'institutional talk'," in *Text*, 20(3): 391-413.

Hofstede, Geert. 1991. *Cultures and Organizations. Software of the Mind*. Berkshire, England: McGraw-Hill Book Company Europe. 68-73; 169-175.

Honda, Atsuko. 2002. "Conflict Management in Japanese Public Affairs Talk Shows," in *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34: 573-806.

Ilie, Cornelia. 2001. "Semi-institutional discourse: The case of talk shows," in *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33: 209-254.

Israeli, Alina. 1997. "Syntactic reduplication in Russian: A cooperative principle device in dialogues", in *Journal of Pragmatics*, 27: 587-609.

Labov, W. & Fanshel, D. 1977. *Therapeutic Discourse.* New York: Academic.

LaFraniere, Sharon. Feb. 27, 2002. "Journalists on Radio In Russia to Resign," in *Washington Post*, A13.

McNair, Brian. 1994. "'Media in Post-Soviet Russia: An Overview," in *European Journal of Communication*, 9: 115-135.

McNair, Brian. 2000. "Power, profit, corruption, and lies: The Russian media in the 1990's," in *De-Westernizing Media Studies.* London: Routledge. 79-94.

Mickiewicz, Ellen. 1998. "Media, Transition, and Democracy: Television and the Transformation of Russia," in *A Communications Cornucopia.* Noll, G. Roger & Price, Monroe E., (eds). Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institutional Press, 113-137.

Pomerantz, Anita, 1984. "Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes," in *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis.* Atkinson, J.M., Herigate, J., (eds). Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 57-102.

Sai-hua, Kuo. 1994. "Agreement and Disagreement Strategies in a Radio Conversation," in *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 27(2): 95-121.

Ribak, Rivka. 2001. "'In the Beginning . . .': Israeli Jews and Arabs Construct *Intifadas* and Selves," in *Constituting Cultural Difference Through Discourse.* Collier, Mary Jane (ed). London, Thousand Oaks (CA) and New Dehli: Sage Publications, 295-318.

Schegloff, Emanuel. 1981. "Discourse as an Interactional Achievement: Some Uses of 'Uh Huh' and Other Things that Come Between Sentences," in *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk.* Tannen, Deborah (ed). Washington: Georgetown University Press. 71-93.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1994. *Approaches to Discourse.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Scollon, Ron & Scollon, Suzanne Wong. 2001. *Intercultural Communication. A Discourse Approach, 2nd ed.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Shaw, Philip. 2000. "The Intercultural Validity of Customer-Complaint Handling Routines," in *Document Design,* 2(2), 180-94.

Tannen, D. 1987. "Repetition in conversation: Toward a poetics of talk," in *Language*, 63: 574 – 605.

Van Dijk, T. (ed). 1997. *Discourse Studies – A Multidisciplinary Introduction – Vol. 1: Discourse as Structure and Process*. London, Thousand Oaks (CA) and New Dehli: Sage Publications.

Van Dijk, T. (ed). 1997. *Discourse Studies – A Multidisciplinary Introduction – Vol. 2: Discourse as Social Interaction.* London, Thousand Oaks (CA) and New Dehli: Sage Publications.

Vartanova, Elena. 2001. "Media Structures: Changed and Unchanged," in *Russian Media Challenge*. Mordenstreng, K, Vartanova, Elena, & Zassoursky, Yasser (eds). Helsinki: Kikimora Publications, 52-164.

Wines, Michael. April 28, 2001. "Russia's Media Variety Survives Network's Travail," in *New York Times on the web.*

Wines, Michael. Nov. 6, 2001. "Putin Grows in Job, Rasing the Question: For Good or Ill?," in *New York Times on the web.*

Yokochi, Yumiko & Hall, Bradford 'J'. 2001. "Exploring the Communication/Culture Connection: A Comparison of Japanese and American Discourse," in *Constituting Cultural Difference Through Discourse.* Collier, Mary Jane (ed). London, Thousand Oaks (CA) and New Dehli: Sage Publications, 158-88.

Zassoursky, Yassen N. 2001. "Media and the Public Interest," in *Russian Media Challenge*. Mordenstreng, K, Vartanova, Elena, & Zassoursky, Yasser (eds). Helsinki: Kikimora Publications, 164-167.

Zupnik, Yael-Janette. 2001. "A Face-Driven Account of Identity Exchanges in Israeli-Palestinian 'Dialogue' Events," in *Constituting Cultural Difference Through Discourse.* Collier, Mary Jane (ed). 271-94.

Appendix 1 – Transcription Notation

: Colon (s): Extended or stretched sound, syllable, or word.

____ Underlining: Vocalic emphasis.

(.) Micropause: Brief pause of less than (0.2).

(1.2) Timed Pause: Intervals occurring within and between same or different speaker's utterance.

(( )) Double Parentheses: Scenic details.

( ) Single Parentheses: Transcriptionist doubt.

. Period: Full stop.

? Question Marks: Interrogative intonation..

<< >> Greater Than/Less Than symbols: Pitch resets; marked rising and falling shifts in intonation.

= Equal Signs: Latching of contiguous utterances, with no interval or overlap.

[ ] Brackets: Speech overlaps.

! Exclamation Points: Animated speech tone.

- Hyphens: Halting, abrupt cut off of sound or word.

> < Less Than/Greater Than Signs: Portions of an utterance delivered at a pace noticeably quicker than surrounding talk.

< > Greater Than/Less Than Signs: Portions of an utterance delivered at a pace noticeably slower than surrounding talk.

OKAY CAPS: Extreme loudness compared with surrounding talk.

hhh H's: Audible in-breaths. The more h's the longer the aspiration.

(The above transcription notation was acquired from the website http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~wbeach/transcription_codes.htm, 2003)

Appendix 2 – Glossary of Terms

Acknowledgement tokens: Also referred to as 'back-channel communication'; acknowledgement tokens are non-lexical items such as "uh mm", "mm" and others which indicate support and implicit agreement, without actually stating it.

Assessment: A statement providing an evaluation or description of something (e.g. That car is beautiful).

Dispreferred responses: Responses that do not comply with the preference features given.

Downgrading: Providing a second assessment that is weaker than the first. This lessens the intensity of first assessment.

Footing shift: To use Irving Goffman's terminology, an alteration of the 'author' (composer of the words), 'animator' (person speaking), or 'principal' (person or party whose view is being expressed) of the statement.

Mitigation: The insertion of agreement/disagreement components, delay devices ("well", "but", "umm") or some other lexical items to forestall the ensuing agreement/disagreement.

Negative interrogative: An interrogative form containing the negation of the main verb of the sentence, followed by the auxiliary verb (e.g., "Can't you play the violin?").

Ordinary conversation: Also called 'everyday conversation' or 'mundane conversation'; refers to conversation occurring "naturally" (or, not under any kind of institutional constraint).

Preference features: Design features which encode a desire for the present statement to be followed by a certain response (such as agreement, or a "no" answer)

Preferred responses: Responses which comply with the preference features given.

Question preface: A statement preceding a question, usually to contextualize the question or to highlight certain things.

Upgrading: Providing a second assessment that is stronger than the first. This intensifies the first assessment.